

Edited by Victor Thorn & Lisa Guliani



Dirty Secrets

**Crime, Conspiracy
& Cover-Up During
the 20th Century**

**A Compendium of the Writings
of Michael Collins Piper,
Interviews with the Author
& Reviews of His Works**

High Praise for the Work of Michael Collins Piper

“Over the years, much has been written about the creature known as the state of Israel. Most of what has been written about her and accepted by those in the West is not true. She has been painted as being a non-threatening friend to humanity, who merely wishes to live in peace with the rest of the world. I have seen the beast up close, however, and I can tell you that this is not the case. There are only a few individuals who are brave and honest enough to paint her in her true light, and one of them is Michael Collins Piper in his books *Final Judgment*, *The High Priests of War* and *The New Jerusalem*.”

Mordechai Vanunu

Former nuclear technician jailed for 18 years for revealing the truth about Israel's nuclear arsenal and ambitions

“Michael Collins Piper—a fearless researcher who uncovers the whole truth—is undoubtedly among the best writers of the 21st century. His previous books have sent shockwaves through the plutocracy, whose activities were exposed for everyone to see. There is no doubt that this work will again do the same.”

Mark Farrell, *Honest Media Today*

“Let others sensationalize conspiracy theories. As a writer and filmmaker who has been vigorously critiqued and corrected by Michael Collins Piper, I know that when I encounter his thoughts and writings, I will indeed find plenty of imagination—but also something much more important: substance I can trust.”

The Rev. Ted Pike, *Why the Mideast Bleeds*



Michael Collins Piper . . .

is a correspondent for *American Free Press* newspaper, a freelance journalist, an international lecturer as well as a popular radio personality. He is the author of *Final Judgment*, *The High Priests of War* and *The New Jerusalem*.

Dirty Secrets

**Crime,
Conspiracy
& Cover-Up
During the
20th Century**

**A Compendium of the Writings
of Michael Collins Piper,
Interviews with the Author
and Reviews of His Works**

**Edited & Compiled by
Victor Thorn and Lisa Guliani**



SISYPHUS PRESS

P.O. Box 10495
State College,
PA 16805-0495

Copyright 2005 by Michael Collins Piper,
Victor Thorn and Lisa Guliani

All rights reserved,
including the right of reproduction
in whole or in part in any form.

First Edition December 2005
Reprinted May 2006

Manufactured in the United States of America

This *American Free Press* edition of *Dirty Secrets* is a reformatted and rebound
edition of *The Michael Collins Piper Reader* originally published
under that name by Victor Thorn and Lisa Guliani



WING TV

www.wingtv.net

Table of Contents

Introduction

A Prophet Without Honor – Mark Glenn

Essays

1	The Monica-Gate/Israeli Connection	15
2	FDR Knew in Advance About Pearl Harbor	21
3	Israeli Attack on U.S.S. Liberty	29
4	The Holocaust is Over – Enough is Enough	35
5	Zionism Moves Against the United Nations	53
6	Israel and Islamic Fundamentalism	63
7	The Federal Reserve Isn't "Federal"	71
8	The Oklahoma City Bombing	77
9	Populist Author Speaks in Malaysia	81

Assassinations

10	Israel Linked to JFK Assassination	91
11	Controversy Surrounds <i>Final Judgment</i> Author	109
12	Peter Jennings and <i>The Kennedy Assassination</i>	113
13	Did Chicago Mafia Really Have a Hand in Killing JFK?	121
14	Mossad Linked to Martin Luther King Assassination	127

Interviews

15	<i>Final Judgment</i> Interview – June 9, 2003	135
16	<i>High Priests of War</i> Interview – May 24, 2004	153
17	American Free Press Week – October 29, 2004	165
18	<i>The New Jerusalem</i> Interview – June 17, 2005	175
19	Oklahoma City Bombing – June 6, 1997	187

Reviews

20	<i>Final Judgment</i> – January 10, 2003	203
21	<i>The High Priests of War</i> – May 17, 2004	235
22	<i>The New Jerusalem</i> – August 31, 2005	237
	Author Biography	243

For more books
from Victor Thorn
and
Lisa Guliani
—including
*The New World
Order Exposed*
and
*The New World
Order Illusion*—
visit
wingtv.net



INTRODUCTION

A Prophet Without Honor

By Mark Glenn

“If you want to know what’s going on in this country, this is where you’re going to find it,” the man behind a table at a gun show told me. I could see that his table was full of all kinds of material similar to what was on the paper that he had just handed me, as well as many other books and newspapers. I looked over the publications that he was selling, and remember seeing a book entitled *Behind Communism*, and I made a mental note to come back to that one. *The Controversy of Zion* was another, which looked to be a little too heavy to digest at that moment. There were newspapers as well—one entitled *Criminal Politics*—and another that really caught my eye because of its professional-looking appearance. It was very simply named *The Spotlight*.

I started scouring *The Spotlight* and realized that a lot of the information dealing with banking, the United Nations, and Israel was very foreign to me; but not so foreign as to be alien. I came across an article about the JFK assassination, which would have been interesting enough all by itself, but it was the name of the writer that caught my eye due to the fact that he proudly included his middle name. This is in a country where people rarely do so. There was no hyphen anywhere separating these names, and for whatever reason this middle name was something that he considered an integral and indivisible part of who he was, and that was how he wanted to be known. What this told me was that his middle name, which he so proudly carried with him, was probably that of someone important in his family, and that he was proud to associate himself with this individual. His name was Michael Collins Piper.

Besides the fact that he used his middle name, there was something about his first name as well that beckoned me towards his article. Michael was the name of the Archangel whose picture I had

always seen as a young boy in church. I had always loved that image of an angel who was wielding a sword, ready to strike downwards with it into his mortal enemy, the devil, who was prostrate beneath the feet of this heavenly warrior—powerless to do anything about it. I had always loved that name and had planned that my first son, if I were blessed enough to have one, would bear that name as well.

Whether the man behind the table knew that I was a big fish or not didn't matter. I was interested, and he had hooked me. I shoved the wad of money back into my pocket and stood there reading the article about JFK, unaware of those who were milling about around me. If the man at the gun table behind me did or said anything that indicated his disappointment, I didn't hear it.

The article on JFK resembled a beautiful young woman I had seen in Italian class a few years ago; and like her, I couldn't take my eyes away. I devoured every word in this article as fast as I could, not thinking of the intellectual indigestion that might result later. I was floored by what Michael Collins Piper was saying: that a foreign government—supposedly an ally of America—was responsible for the murder of our president. He laid it all out very succinctly and professionally, and there was nothing in his presentation that smacked of academic sloppiness. He wasn't covering UFO's or Bigfoot or the Loch Ness Monster. His thesis (and the presentation of it) was unlike anything I had ever encountered in my college history courses, regardless of the fact that it was obviously not a mainstream theory. I turned to the man behind the table who had lured me over.

"You mean it was *Israel* who killed John F. Kennedy?" I asked in shock. He must have been watching me the whole time as I read the article, because his eyes and mine met as soon as I looked up at him. The man's face was grave as he nodded his head slowly up and down a few times without blinking his eyes. "There's a lot more than that, son," he added.

I scarfed up as many of *The Spotlight* newspapers as I could

without cleaning him out. I also looked over the books he had for sale, but decided that the newspapers would be enough for now. Although I didn't realize it at the time, this was one of those life-changing moments upon which individuals look back and can chart all the secondary effects that follow in its wake.

In *The Spotlight* I began reading the words of a writer named Michael Collins Piper. Without Mr. Piper realizing it, I would eventually become—over the ensuing years—his understudy, and he would become my mentor. From a distance of many miles, he tutored me as a Jedi master teaches a Padwan learner. While other 'cutting-edge' writers were talking about UFOs and the Reptilians, he was methodically and meticulously fleshing out the image of a beast that had taken control of the most powerful nation in the world. Like a special prosecutor, he charted the names, events, dates and peculiarities of the most dangerous criminal conspiracy that has existed in history, and was getting very little recognition for doing so. The rest of the resistance movement was more interested in black helicopters and UN troops who were stationed in the national forests rather than understanding the mechanics of the Zionist agenda. After years of listening to what my grandfather had said, something finally snapped into place and I began understanding it all. This was in no small part due to what I had learned from Michael Collins Piper in a weekly populist newspaper called *The Spotlight*, later to be replaced by *American Free Press*.

Without knowing it, Piper had taught me how to read the tea leaves of what was taking place in the political world, and in particular the involvement that this entity known as Zionism played in it. As a result of his analysis, it was as if I had been given special glasses, not unlike the ones needed to watch a 3-D movie; without which the picture remains fuzzy and two-dimensional. By now it had been a long time since I graduated from the likes of Rush Limbaugh and G. Gordon Liddy, for the information these men (who had somehow become extremely popular in recent

years) were attempting to peddle to the American people was child's play, comparatively speaking. They were lightweights, and that was putting it as politely as possible, since it became obvious that what they were really doing was protecting the beast by deflecting attention onto other matters.

Finally, the day came for me to put all these years of study to the test. Like any graduate student seeking an advanced degree, a dissertation must be presented to the review board. One does not receive their advanced degree by simply attending classes for many years. He or she must take what has been learned and put it to practical use. I was about to be cut loose from my mentor and sent out to wage war, using the techniques he had taught me, but with my own particular style and flair.

My dissertation began on a date that changed America forever—September 11, 2001—and whether such a change will be for the better or for the worse remains to be seen. To be honest, I was not as surprised at what happened on that day as was the bulk of America. Like many others who had lived with the knowledge that an evil agenda was clawing its way to the top in this country, I had come to recognize the hand of this agenda in many things ... Ruby Ridge, Waco, the World Trade Center bombing in 1993, and the mother of them all up until that point, Oklahoma City.

The fact that I wasn't surprised didn't keep me from watching the news coverage which was taking place all day. I had learned from reading Mr. Piper's works that the agenda can be very sloppy in the immediate aftermath of such operations, and that it was in this early period that the most important information makes its way past the censors. Piper had shown for years in his pieces how, in the early hours following any operation, there remains crucial material in ferreting out the truth of what really happened. I learned this lesson after Oklahoma City when reports surfaced in the immediate hours after the explosion that there were multiple bombs still *inside* the Alfred P. Murrah Building. Yet

by day's end there was no mention of these items, despite the fact that there had been raw video footage seen by millions of people in the opening hours that showed bomb squads gingerly carrying out explosive devices.

On September 11th, I watched with fanatical concentration the initial coverage just to make sure that it wasn't an accident of some sort. When I heard about a second plane hitting the Trade Towers, I knew that an operation was in full swing. From what I had been reading before and after Bush's election, everything indicated that America was going to war again in the Middle East, only this time in a much larger fashion than had taken place in the previous decade. I had read newspaper reports of the planned operations that were brewing in Afghanistan two months before 9-11 took place. George Bush Jr., son of the man who in 1991 had first taken America to war for the benefit of the Jewish state, had now (under his father's direction, no doubt) surrounded himself with people who were all tied to big-time oil interests. He had been given a "thumbs up" from the Israel First Lobby, and had an unprecedented amount of money in his campaign.

What all of this meant was obvious to me: it would only be a matter of minutes before the Zionist-owned media in America was going to blame this on some swarthy, smelly, murderous Muslim organization in order to justify a full-scale war in the Middle East. As it turned out, it only did take minutes.

Within hours of this taking place, my phone was ringing off the wall. All my friends who knew of my Middle Eastern descent wanted to know what I thought of all this. It was a maddening experience, in all honesty. Even the ones who had come to distrust the government/media complex over the last few years still possessed an inclination to 'run home to momma' at times such as these and refused to afford any credibility to what I had to say. As I explained things such as Zionism and the agenda it possessed to eventually grab up all the land and oil in the Middle East, all I received were uninterested stares and uncomfortable silences.

Like the rest of America, they preferred a 'drive through' version of the truth that was quickly prepared and easily digested. Besides, Islamic fundamentalism sounded so much more interesting to individuals such as these with their politically uneventful lives. They were, for the most part, conservative Christians who were fed-up with their faith and values being attacked, and therefore vented this pent-up anger at what was at that time a very convenient target, meaning those in the Muslim world. Despite my best apologetics, there was no convincing them of the fact that they were being snookered by the same people who were responsible for dragging Christian culture into the sewer in the first place.

And it was at that moment, in a very small way, that I understood what an exhausting task it was trying to bring truth to a people who did not want to hear it ... of trying to make them see an elephant in a room that was impossible to miss, yet which they refused to acknowledge. I was pulling my hair out, and this had only been over the course of a few months. It was then that I came to hold in awe those individuals who had been doing this same thing for years, and yet who kept on going. They were, in the words used by Jesus, the first to stand up against the Jewish supremacist agenda, *prophets without honor in their own home*; and for me, the one at the top of that list was Michael Collins Piper.

At that moment I recognized my responsibility in this matter, It was to not sit by and watch as these men, the Michael Collins Pipers of the world, do all the work for our benefit. They were the watchmen trying to expose the nature of this beast that threatened to devour us all. Were it not for the fact that they were, literally speaking, risking life, liberty and pursuit of happiness for the rest of us, we would have been mere statistics by now. The gangsters whom they were trying to expose were like vampires who feared the light of day more than anything, and in this case the light of day was the truth that men such as Michael Collins

Piper was shining on their actions. He and the others like him were not supermen, they could only do so much and could only go so far, and if there weren't individuals who were willing to take up the torch for them at the end of the day, then the fire was going to die for sure ... and it was at this moment that I decided to take up that torch as well.

Mark Glenn
September 11, 2005

Mark Glenn is the author of *No Beauty in the Beast: Israel Without Her Mascara*



SECTION ONE

Essays



CHAPTER ONE

The Monica-Gate/Israeli Connection

Maybe Hillary Clinton is right: there is a “right-wing conspiracy” to destroy her husband. But don’t count on Hillary to tell you whose “right-wing” is behind that conspiracy—and how the scandal is being used to manipulate U.S. Middle East policy.

Hillary Clinton’s argument that a “right wing conspiracy” in America is behind the ongoing sex-and-perjury scandal that may topple her husband has one big flaw: after all, it is the major media in America—led by *The Washington Post* and *Newsweek*, joined by the *New York Times* and *Time* magazine—along with the major networks, that have been hyping the scandal and suggesting that it may be Bill Clinton’s undoing. *Newsweek* itself enlisted longtime Clinton confidant George Stephanapolous to write of Clinton’s “betrayal,” and young Stephanapolous, now an ABC commentator, even went on the air to bring up the possibilities of resignation and impeachment.

And nobody has ever accused any of those major media voices of being a voice for the “right wing”—or the “right wing” in America, at least.

However, the first lady may have put her finger on something when she claimed that a “right wing conspiracy” is energizing the “Monica-gate” scandal. But don’t count on the first lady to dare raise the suspicion that it’s more than just certain elements in the American right wing that have helped bring the scandal to the public eye.

In fact, if you dig deep enough, you will find a connection that goes all the way to the hard-line “right wing” in Israel, and all the way back to “Monica-gate” right here in Washington, D.C.

It thus may be no coincidence that just as the American sup-

porters of Israel's right wing—the Likud bloc—were launching a major (and bitter) public relations campaign against President Clinton, the major media in America picked up the lead and suddenly began trumpeting the allegations about yet another Clinton “sexcapade.”

Let's look at some basic facts (reported in the major media itself) that have somehow gotten buried in the midst of all the frenzy over the allegations that have been bandied about.

First of all, although the media has focused on former White House staffer Linda Tripp and her brassy New York promoter friend, Lucianne Goldberg, as being the prime instigators of “Monica-gate,” *The Washington Post* pointed out rather circuitously in a story buried at the back of the paper on January 28, 1998 that lawyers for Paula Jones ‘first received several anonymous tips that Lewinsky may have had a sexual relationship with the president.’ It apparently wasn't until after lawyers for Paula Jones contacted Miss Lewinsky that the president was tipped off that his (presumed) relationship with Lewinsky had been exposed.

At this juncture, it seems apparent neither the aforementioned Tripp nor Goldberg was the source, inasmuch as they had other interests to exploit in the Clinton-Lewinsky caper. In fact, Tripp instead went directly to Special Prosecutor Kenneth Starr.

Therefore, the big question is this: who tipped off the lawyers for Paula Jones that there might be a “smoking gun” in the president's relationship with Monica Lewinsky?

Monica Lewinsky—at least until recently, it seems—was a Clinton loyalist, and it was certainly not Miss Lewinsky who leaked the story to the lawyers. So someone close to—or spying on—the president's inner circle had to have leaked the word about the president's relationship with Miss Lewinsky (however innocent or not so innocent) to Jones' attorneys.

Could it have been someone in Al Gore's camp—close to the White House—eager to move the vice president into the Oval Office? That's speculation, of course, but not beyond the realm of

possibility.

But let's go further. Although Michael Isikoff of *Newsweek* (published by the Meyer-Graham empire, which also owns *The Washington Post*) was the first journalist officially "digging into" the story, it now turns out that, according to the *Post*, reporting in passing on January 28, 1998 that one William Kristol—described generally as "editor of the conservative *Weekly Standard*"—as having been one of the first to "publicly mention" the allegations.

Kristol's role as being one of the "first" to float the story publicly, you see, is critical to understanding the big picture. Not only is Kristol the front man for billionaire media tycoon Rupert Murdoch—a major ally of Israel's hard-line Likud—but Kristol himself is the son of journalist Irving Kristol and historian Gertrude Himmelfarb, two self-styled "former Marxists" who have emerged as "neo-conservative" figures with long-standing close ties to Israel's "anti-communist right wing."

Young Kristol is, like his parents, a "Likudnik" and has been a harsh critic of President Clinton's decision to "turn his back" on Israel.

Also significant is that Kristol, like Clinton, has been initiated into the Bilderberg Group, the high-level elite foreign policy conclave dominated by the Rockefeller and Rothschild families, although Kristol (obviously) is identified with Bilderberg's "Republican" wing.

And on January 26, 1998 just as the Lewinsky affair began escalating and engulfing Clinton, Kristol released a letter to Clinton, pressuring the president to launch a military attack on Israel's hated enemy, Iraq.

Signing the letter along with Kristol were a bevy of other famed American supporters of Israel's "right wing," including former Representative Vin Weber, a longtime close ally of House Speaker Newt Gingrich, and Richard Perle, a former deputy Secretary of Defense who is now a highly-paid consultant for

Israeli arms interests.

Then, in light of the Kristol-Murdoch connection, it is interesting to note that Murdoch's Fox television is essentially leading the charge in the Establishment media forcing the other networks to compete.

The Fox News Channel has carried the story almost non-stop around the clock. Even when other features have been telecast, they have been subject to interruption for any breaking developments in the Clinton scandal, regardless of how mundane they might be.

One daytime Fox tabloid show even brought in a reported specialist in "body language" to view a videotape of Clinton and Miss Lewinsky meeting in a receiving line, after which the so-called specialist declared that Clinton was treating the young girl as though she were "the first lady."

In addition, some of the tawdriest stories to break in the burgeoning scandal have been in the *New York Post*, along with other Murdoch-owned news publications.

Also notice that in recent days, Starr has been "going slow" in pursuing the scandal, which, when all facets of it are examined, could fizzle. After all, nothing has been proven—yet.

Even consumer advocate Ralph Nader has been pointing out publicly that despite all of the media frenzy and reportage, the press has been reporting mere allegations as though they were proven facts.

Could it be that a powerful pressure group is waiting to see how Clinton will react against Iraq?

At a recent town hall meeting in Charlotte, North Carolina, House Speaker Newt Gingrich (R-Ga.), a strong supporter of the Netanyahu regime, brought boos from the crowd, which was mostly Republican, when he called the president's treatment of the Israeli prime minister "below the dignity of America."

Gingrich was referring to Clinton's efforts to get the Israeli leader to take a more conciliatory view toward achieving a peace

settlement in the Middle East.

In the meantime, in her effort to once again “stand by her man,” the first lady has named television preacher Jerry Falwell and his friend, Sen. Jesse Helms (R-N.C.) as among those who are part of the “right wing conspiracy” that is out to get her president.

What Hillary has not mentioned is that both Falwell and Helms are especially close to—once again—the hard-line “right wing” Likud bloc in Israel, and both are adamantly opposed to President Clinton’s perceived support for Likud’s rivals in Israel’s Labor Party, which has been far more amenable to the peace process.

Clinton was not a backer of Netanyahu in the Israeli elections that brought the current Likud extremist coalition to power, and was embarrassed politically when Netanyahu won by defeating the liberals led by the more moderate Shimon Peres. The latter preached peace; Netanyahu, no compromise.

As *The Spotlight* reported on February 2, 1998 even prior to his official meeting with President Clinton, the Israeli prime minister had already met with (and appeared at a pro-Likud rally in the company of) Rev. Jerry Falwell, one of Clinton’s most vociferous critics.

The Spotlight noted that even *The Washington Post* had revealed on January 22, 1998 that “a senior Netanyahu official had said the Israeli leader was prepared to respond to opposition from the White House by demonstrating his ‘own ammunition’ in U.S. political circles”—namely Falwell and the boisterous pro-Zionist “Christian right.”

In Israel itself, according to the *Post* on January 24, 1998, the press has “lapped up the Clinton allegations.” The *Post* said that “interest seemed particularly sharp because Monica Lewinsky is Jewish.”

Writing in the January 22, 1998 issue of the Israeli daily *Yedioth Aharonoth*, Nahum Barnea wryly commented: “We innocently thought the fate of the peace process was in the hands of a

Jewess, born in Prague, named Madeleine Albright. Apparently, the fate of the peace process is, to no lesser degree, in the hands of another Jewess, named Monica Lewinsky, 24 years old, a Beverly Hills native, who spent a fun-filled summer three years ago as an [intern] at the White House.”

What is interesting is that by the time Barnea’s comments were repeated in the February 2, 1998 issue of *Newsweek*, which devoted a special issue to the scandal, *Newsweek* had carefully edited Barnea’s words so that they now read: “It turns out that the fate of the peace process depends on a different woman.”

In fact, the Lewinsky scandal has forced the president into retreat as far as pushing Israel is concerned—much to the delight of Israel’s Likud.

On January 27, *The Washington Post* again let the cat out of the bag when it reported, “Last week, Clinton demonstrated he could not compel the Israelis to meet their responsibilities for a further military pullback. This week [in the wake of the scandal] he is even less capable, if only because people in his own party, not to mention the Republicans, will not support a policy of greater pressure on Israel.”

Those watching the Clinton scandal unfold must surely wonder why the Establishment media is, in fact, rushing to judgment in many instances, while trying, unsuccessfully, to display an image of impartiality.

It is almost as if there is, somewhere, a large switch on the wall labeled “Get Clinton,” and someone has flipped it on.

CHAPTER TWO

Roosevelt Crony Says: “FDR Knew in Advance About Pearl Harbor”

Perhaps dozens of books and hundreds of monographs have been written proving that FDR knew well in advance that the Japanese were planning their December 7, 1941 attack on Pearl Harbor. Yet, only one of FDR's associates has admitted that.

An American journalist, Joseph Leib, a former aide to President Franklin D. Roosevelt, learned one full week before it happened that the Japanese were about to attack Pearl Harbor. And to his horror, he also learned that FDR himself also knew of the impending attack and intended to let it happen.

Leib, who was the founder of the first Roosevelt for President Club, learned of the impending attack on Saturday, November 28, 1941. Here's what occurred. On that date, Leib received an urgent call from Secretary of State Cordell Hull. Hull asked that Leib meet him near the White House, and the two then walked to Lafayette Park, across from the executive mansion. The highest ranking member of the cabinet then proceeded to tell Leib a story that left the young journalist reeling.

Hull burst into tears, and then explained why he was so distraught. Hull told Leib the Japanese were planning to attack Pearl Harbor within a few days, and as evidence, the secretary handed Leib a transcript of Japanese radio messages intercepted by American intelligence.

Hull explained to Leib that he had chosen to tell Leib the story for one reason alone: in the past Leib had been a reliable confidant. “You're the only one I can trust,” the agitated Hull told Leib.

Leib then prodded Hull for further details. It was then Hull

admitted that foreknowledge of the impending Japanese attack extended as high as the White House itself.

“Roosevelt wants us in this war,” said Hull, “and he’s willing to risk the attack on Hawaii to give him the opportunity to get us into the war. The president is fully aware of the plans, and so is [J. Edgar] Hoover at the FBI.

“That’s why I can’t have a press conference and expose it publicly,” Hull said. “The president would denounce me and no one would believe me.”

After promising the Secretary of State that he would not reveal his source, Leib promptly made a beeline for the offices of *United Press*, taking with him a copy of the transcript of the Japanese radio intercepts.

At *United Press*, Leib approached Bureau Chief Lyle Wilson with the story. Wilson refused to believe the tale, and Leib was forced to turn elsewhere.

Harry Frantz, former cable editor at *United Press*, agreed to transmit Leib’s highly sensational story, but in transmission the final version was incomplete. And only one newspaper in the entire world carried the story.

The November 20 issue of the *Honolulu Advertiser* cried in a banner headline, “Japanese May Attack Over Weekend,” noting that U.S. forces in Hawaii were on alert. Yet the story failed to mention, as Leib had written, that the target of the Japanese attack would be Hawaii—specifically Pearl Harbor in Honolulu—itsself.

Speculation among military people who expected a Japanese attack, but who were not privy to the decoded secret message, centered on other U.S. installations in the Pacific closer to Japan. Newsmen were aware of this speculation. If the *Advertiser* had received a story that contained a date of an expected attack, but was garbled enough to obscure the intended target, the headline and story it carried would be a reasonable reaction.

Honolulu was a “military town” in November, 1941, and military operations by the Japanese in the Pacific were of much more

immediate interest to the readers of the *Advertiser* than to people on the mainland.

Should the Japanese have attacked a U.S. Western Pacific installation, it would undoubtedly have precipitated a mass movement of Navy personnel and equipment from the Honolulu area, which would make the editors of that newspaper much more sensitive to any story of that nature, no matter how garbled.

In a February, 1984 interview with this author, Leib pointed out that, "If I had been able to get my story out then—the week before Pearl Harbor, Pearl Harbor would never have taken place."

In fact, one month after the attack on Pearl Harbor, Cordell Hull's allegation that the FBI knew of the impending attack was conformed in a brief article in the *Washington Times-Herald*. However, later editions of the same paper deleted this important story as a result of pressure from FBI Director Hoover. "We didn't have a free press then," said Leib, "and we don't have a free press now."

The actual attack on Pearl Harbor was, of course, no more a surprise to Leib than it was to Roosevelt. But an incident shortly after the attack did catch Leib by surprise: Wilson of *United Press* called Leib to his office and gave Leib Roosevelt's own personally edited press release containing the transcript of FDR's "Day of Infamy" speech in which he asked Congress to declare war on Japan.

Leib asked Wilson why he was giving him this valuable document. "Steve Early gave it to me," said Wilson, referring to his close friend who was FDR's press secretary. "I told him that you had brought me the story of the impending attack, but that I hadn't used it. It was his way of saying 'thanks.'"

"If I had used the story," Wilson lamented, "we might have saved thousands of lives."

However, as Leib noted later, Roosevelt had already entangled the United States in Europe's conflicts, setting the stage for war. "We had people overseas eight months before the war." As for the results of the war, Leib remained cynical in retrospect. "We

didn't win World War II. We lost it. The Soviets won World War II. We gave the USSR everything. We walked out and gave the Reds everything.

"And even before Pearl, when Hitler was pushing toward Moscow, we spent \$1.5 billion to save the USSR. Did that make sense? That's what happened: We just handed everything to the USSR." Leib concluded that he didn't think it was an accident. "It was by design."

Leib recalled that during the 1932 presidential campaign he had asked FDR what he would do if he got elected. "He said that one of the first things he would do would be to recognize the USSR." Leib asked FDR why he wanted to do that, and the presidential candidate responded, "Well, the Soviets have a big market for our products."

Leib was confused. He knew the Soviet economy was lagging, and asked FDR, "How are they going to pay for our products?" FDR responded, "Well, we'll lend them the money."

With some irony, Leib recalled later that FDR once wrote a letter to British Prime Minister Winston Churchill in which he told him that he could twist Soviet dictator Josef Stalin around his finger. "In fact," according to Leib, "it happened just the other way. Stalin twisted Roosevelt around his finger." And that, of course, led to Soviet expansion through Eastern Europe for a generation.

Leib's memories of FDR, the era of the New Deal, and World War II were quite pointed.

With some sadness, Leib remembered the manner in which FDR dealt with Secretary of State Cordell Hull, of whom Leib was fond. "You'd be amazed at the things that Roosevelt did to him." On one occasion, Leib said, Hull had told him a long list of indignities that he (Hull) had suffered at FDR's hands.

According to Leib, "Hull was no New Dealer. He was very hurt by everything that was happening. But he was tired of the Senate, where he'd served many years, and had agreed to serve in the administration."

According to Leib, Hull never attempted to expose the president's Pearl Harbor treachery for one reason: "Hull was an old man, and if he had exposed the president, he didn't want to have to go through the pressure that I have gone through."

Leib noted that, "After all I did against Roosevelt; you would assume that he would have charged me publicly with sedition. But he did behind the scenes, though."

Leib recalled the infamous "sedition trial" in which critics of FDR's foreign policy were, in fact, charged with sedition (only to have the charges dropped and the case declared a mistrial when the presiding judge died).

Leib recalled with particular distaste the treatment dealt famed American poet Ezra Pound. "He drove Roosevelt so batty [with his radio broadcasts from Italy]. Roosevelt harassed Attorney General Francis Biddle so much to get Pound, and they finally succeeded. Biddle didn't want to do it, but they finally did. I think it was shameful what they did to Pound."

(Pound was incarcerated after the war for over a decade at St. Elizabeth's Hospital, a mental institution in Washington, having been officially declared "insane" and unable to stand trial on spurious charges of treason.)

Leib's recollections of "Roosevelt the man" are equally pointed. "You couldn't believe anything he said. Roosevelt was a treacherous man, and nobody was really close to him. Everybody thought they were close to him, but they weren't.

"I saw Roosevelt talk to people, and they left him with the impression that he agreed with them—but it was just the opposite." Leib remembered one occasion, for example, when FDR was still governor of New York. Leib saw FDR charming a group of publishers who had come to visit him, but no sooner had they left than Roosevelt was issuing a press release containing a message the exact opposite of what he had told the publishers.

With some amusement, Leib recalled the impact of FDR's famed "fireside chats." Leib pointed out: "FDR made the same

fireside chats when he was governor and they called him a clown and said, 'Listen to that sissy voice.' But when he became president and did the same thing, they said: 'Oh, what a wonderful orator and what a great personality.' That's what good publicity does for one," said Leib.

"Roosevelt was effective—terribly effective—" recalled Leib. "Too much so." Leib, in fact, was quite qualified to make such an assessment. He began his career as a Roosevelt devotee, as a key national organizer for FDR's 1932 presidential campaign.

Through relatives, Leib met Roosevelt in 1928 when FDR was boosting the ill-fated presidential campaign of Democrat Al Smith. Roosevelt was then running for his first term as governor of New York. In 1930, when FDR was seeking his second term, Leib formed the first Roosevelt for President Club. And by the end of 1930, Leib was directing nearly 100 Roosevelt for President Clubs in 21 different states.

Leib came to Washington with FDR after the 1932 presidential election victory, and it was there that he came to know many of the high-ranking "brain trust" surrounding FDR. And the aforementioned Secretary of State Hull was one of those with whom he became close.

However, Leib grew dissatisfied as he saw the New Deal in action. The National Recovery Administration, for which Leib worked, was undermining small business in favor of big business, and the Agricultural Adjustment Administration, for which Leib also worked, encouraged farmers to destroy their crops, dairy products, and animals—as millions of Americans were on the verge of starvation.

As a result, Leib said, "Almost every original man I worked with for Roosevelt turned against Roosevelt." Leib himself soon began to part ways with FDR and started to do freelance work, writing speeches, press releases and news stories from Washington.

"Eight months after FDR was elected to his second term [in

1936] I predicted that he was going to run for a third term and everybody laughed at me.” In fact, it was Leib’s insistence upon exposing FDR’s plan to make a bid for a third term that led to Leib’s break with his one-time hero and mentor.

Leib based his charge that FDR was planning a third-term bid on a letter which Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr. had written him (Leib), declaring, “The necessity for deciding such an issue has not yet arisen since what we feel today may have to be revised three years from now in light of circumstances beyond our control, such as the foreign situation.” This was, Leib noted, three years before the United States entered the war, and two years before Hitler invaded Poland on September 1, 1939.

Yet FDR did seek a third term, and as Leib predicted, used the “foreign situation”—the war—as one of his reasons for asking the support of the American people in breaking the “no third term” tradition.

As a consequence, in later years, Leib was one of the prime movers and shakers behind the institution of the 22nd Amendment to the Constitution which limited a president to two elective terms of office.

Speaking in 1984, Leib frowned upon the fond memories that many Americans—including then-President Ronald Reagan, had for Franklin D. Roosevelt. “It seems to be universal,” he noted. “And I’m afraid because of that we will continue to make mistakes; and those responsible will get away with it.”

Leib himself had fond memories of some towering figures of the period, however. “Burton Wheeler was probably an honest man. Gerald Nye was another. Hamilton Fish was a good soul. So was Robert Taft. He was a good, honest man. Douglas MacArthur might have been a good president. He was certainly a better general than a lot of the others.”

After the war erupted, Leib, as a freelance journalist, launched a personal investigation into defense contract profiteering that led to a full-fledged congressional inquiry into the matter.

Leib was also credited with successfully pushing for the revamping of the wartime Army Air Corps Safety Bureau and the correction of defective aircraft production methods. "I didn't do it for any reward," he said. "I was satisfied with the knowledge that I saved lives and money."

Leib was the recipient of a special award from the Aerospace Defense Command for his efforts and was also widely recognized by numerous members of Congress for his work. A number of resolutions calling for Leib to be awarded a Congressional Medal of Honor were introduced into Congress on various occasions. What's more, Leib himself served in the U.S. Army and, afterward, was highly active in veterans groups. He retired in the Washington, D.C. area, in Arlington, Virginia, where he died.

CHAPTER THREE

Israeli Attack on the *USS Liberty*

Here's a capsule overview of the shocking circumstances surrounding the murder of 34 Americans by the armed forces of Israel in a terrorist attack that few Americans know about. Tito Howard's new film, *Loss of Liberty*, is the must see "last word" documentary that tells all of these details and more.

On June 8, 1967, the *U.S.S. Liberty*, an American naval vessel sailing in the Mediterranean, was suddenly and deliberately attacked by naval and air forces of the state of Israel. The attack took place in the middle of a sunny afternoon. The American flag aboard the *Liberty* flapped clearly in the breeze. Three unmarked Israeli aircraft, accompanied by three torpedo boats, conducted the brutal assault.

The attack began with rockets, and then continued with napalm, a burning chemical that clings to human skin with grisly results. Then the torpedo boats raked the decks of the *Liberty* with machine-gun fire as the American sailors tried to extinguish the fires started by the napalm. The *Liberty* was then torpedoed not once, but three times. Miraculously, it did not sink. Thirty-four Americans died in the incident, and 171 others were injured.

When news of the attack reached the White House, President Lyndon B. Johnson alerted the commander of the Sixth Fleet to prepare for retaliatory action, assuming the Egyptians were responsible. Later, when the president learned the Israelis were responsible, he called off the alert.

Very little about the tragedy was mentioned in the American press. What reports there were indicated it was a "tragic mistake." In addition, media accounts underestimated the number of the dead.

Then, under the direction of Admiral John S. McCain, commander in chief of the U.S. Naval Forces in Europe, a court of inquiry was conducted by Rear Admiral I. C. Kidd. McCain and Kidd knew better,

but they still announced that the attack was “a case of mistaken identity.”

(McCain’s cover up for Israel’s slaughter of American Navy boys forged a unique tie between the McCain family and Israel, such that today McCain’s son, John, the Republican senator from Arizona, is Israel’s favorite Republican.)

The *Liberty* survivors were told to “shut up.” Anyone who talked was threatened with court-martial. “If anyone asks,” the sailors were told, “tell them it was an accident.” The survivors were dispersed worldwide so that no two men were sent to the same place.

The incident was mentioned in passing in a variety of media, but the first time that the whole shocking story was told on a national scale was in *The Spotlight* on April 26, 1976.

However, as early as one month after the tragedy, on July 15, 1967, *The Washington Observer* newsletter, published by individuals associated with Liberty Lobby, the Washington-based populist institution, told readers that the Israeli attack on the American vessel was indeed deliberate.

There is no question the Israelis not only intended to sink the *Liberty*, but also to kill the entire crew so that no living witnesses could emerge to point the finger at the Israelis. The Israelis hoped to blame the Arabs for the crime—a long-standing “false flag” technique used by Israel in its numerous acts of terrorism.

Defenders of Israel demand to know why the Israelis would desire the total destruction of the *Liberty* and the mass murder of all aboard. The explanation is simple: the *Liberty* was a spy ship—said to be then the most sophisticated in the world—gathering intelligence information that would have demonstrated that contrary to Israel’s public propaganda line, Israel was seeking to escalate the 1967 Six-Day War then in progress by attempting to expand its territorial gains, while at the same time planning an incursion into Arab territories in the West Bank and the Gaza Strip. It would have also shown that Israel, not the Arab states,

was the real aggressor, and that they intended to invade Syria.

A *Spotlight* report of Nov. 21, 1977 implicated the CIA's counterintelligence chief, James J. Angleton, in having conspired with Israel in orchestrating the attack on the *Liberty*. An Israeli loyalist who headed the CIA's liaison with Israel's intelligence agency, the Mossad, and who also played a key role in helping Israel develop its nuclear arsenal (in defiance of President John F. Kennedy), Angleton believed the destruction of the *Liberty* could be used as a "Pearl Harbor" or "Remember the Maine" type incident to inflame American passions against the Arabs.

In 1983, a top secret report prepared in 1967 by the legal advisor to the U.S. secretary of state, was released (without fanfare) for the first time. The report assessed claims by Israel that the attack was a mistake. The report demonstrated Israel's claims to be lies. For example:

- The Israelis claimed that the *Liberty* was traveling at a high (and therefore suspicious) speed of 28 to 30 knots. In fact, the ship was drifting along at only five knots.

- The Israelis claimed that the *Liberty* refused to identify itself. In fact, the only signals from the Israeli torpedo boats came after the torpedo attack had already been launched, with the result that 25 sailors had already died when the *Liberty* was hit by an Israeli torpedo.

- The Israelis claimed that the *Liberty* did not fly an American flag or carry identifying insignia. In fact, not only did the *Liberty* have a U.S. flag flying in the wind, but after that flag was shot down, another and much larger flag was hoisted by the American sailors when they realized they were under attack by ostensibly "friendly" forces from "our ally, Israel." In addition, the *Liberty's* name and identification numbers were clearly displayed on the hull which had just recently been painted.

According to *Liberty* survivors, the Israeli aircraft had actually circled the ship no less than 13 times for several hours before the attack commenced. Some of the *Liberty* sailors even waved to

the “friendly” Israelis from the decks of the ship, not knowing that they were targeted for annihilation shortly thereafter.

Here are just a handful of comments by American survivors of the Israeli attack on the *Liberty*. Their views represent the thinking of many other survivors. Could all of these American servicemen be “mistaken” or otherwise “lying”—as advocates of Israel contend—about Israel’s culpability in the tragic *Liberty* affair?

- Ernie Gallo: “The day before [the attack] I was topside when Israeli planes came by—and very close where we could wave to the pilots—and they were that close where we could wave back.”

- Rick Aimetti: “It was a very clear day. It was a warm day, the sun was shining brightly, a nice breeze blowing and I distinctly remember hearing the [American] flag flapping in the wind.”

- Phil Tourney: “There were approximately thirteen sorties of our ship from six o’clock until 12 o’clock in the afternoon. We had a general quarters drill that lasted forty-five minutes or so.”

- Stan White: “I stepped out on deck and a plane came by and I looked right in the cockpit. He waved. I waved. That’s how close they were. They knew who we were.”

- George Golden: “Of all the recon flights they had that morning—overlooking our ship for six to seven hours—they had a good idea what they were doing, and they hit us hard and fast with everything they had.”

- James Smith: “I was topside fighting fires and doing other damage control work throughout the duration of the attack. At the same time I was able to observe the jets flying overhead, and I also observed the American flag flying from the mast. At no time did that flag hang limp from the mast.”

Joe Meadors: “My only job during the attack was to make sure that the flag was flying, so every few minutes I would walk out to the signal bridge up at the mast.”

The American survivors of Israel’s brutal terrorist attack on

the *USS Liberty* have charged that the nature of the assault definitely constituted a war crime.

Survivor Lloyd Painter recalls: "I personally witnessed the machine-gunning of life rafts as they floated by. The Israeli torpedo boat crew members raked the life rafts thoroughly with machine gun fire, making sure that if there had been anyone in the life rafts, they would not have survived." Another survivor, Don Bocher, has pointed out that plans to abandon the ship were called off because the life rafts had been shot up. In fact, shooting life rafts on a ship in distress is a war crime.

Josey Toth Linen, whose brother Stephen died on the *Liberty*, also points out: "My brother was sent to the bridge of the ship to find out who the planes were and where they came from. They had no markings. That's against the Geneva Rules of War right there . . . He was cut down by the planes."

Therefore, Israel did indeed commit war crimes in the course of its unwarranted attack on the friendly American vessel.

Survivor David Lewis adds: "Had [the ship] sunk, I assume that when debris washed ashore the next day, it would have been blamed on Egypt ... helicopter gun-ships, I'm sure, would have picked off survivors if we had abandoned ship. They were sent there to finish us off. The aircraft were sent to make us incommunicado so we couldn't send out an SOS. The torpedo boats were sent to sink us.

"And the helicopters were sent to pick off survivors. It was a perfectly executed military operation. If you look at photographs of the *Liberty* after the attack, on the first strafing run they used heat-seeking missiles that took out the tuning section of every transmitter on the ship. In less than two seconds they had taken out all our communication capability."

The ship's captain, W. L. McGonagle, echoed the concerns of the other survivors, noting that: "It appeared from the ferocity of the attack that the intent of the attackers was to sink the ship. Maybe they hoped to have no survivors so that they would not be

held accountable for the attack after it occurred.”

CHAPTER FOUR

An American of American-Indian Heritage Speaks Out: The Holocaust is Over; Enough is Enough

The controversy over “Who Killed John F. Kennedy?” has been written about almost as much as “the Holocaust.” Thus, it was perhaps inevitable that these two unrelated controversies would, once and for all, finally become intertwined. Quite unwittingly I played a part in that bizarre phenomenon.

In the summer of 1997 I was invited to speak about my book, *Final Judgment: The Missing Link in the JFK Assassination Conspiracy*, at a community college seminar in Orange County, California. The thesis of the book is that Israel’s intelligence agency, the Mossad, played a front-line role alongside the CIA and the Meyer Lansky Crime Syndicate in the assassination of President Kennedy.

Almost instantaneously the sponsor of the seminar and I were hit by a national media barrage instigated by the Anti-Defamation League (ADL) of B’nai B’rith. The ADL told the press (which obligingly reported the allegation) that I was “a Holocaust denier” and that, for that reason alone, I should be denied the opportunity to discuss my book.

In reality, my book has nothing whatsoever to do with the Holocaust, but apparently the ADL had determined that the best way to discredit me in the eyes of the public and the academic community was to level the ultimate smear—that I (God forbid) “denied the Holocaust.”

Determined to shift the focus from what my book really does address—the role of Israel’s Mossad in the JFK assassination con-

spiracy, the ADL had evidently decided that making allegations about my purported views on the Holocaust was the best way to jar the public and set off a firestorm of opposition—a “holocaust,” so to speak—to prevent me from being heard.

Perhaps I shouldn’t have been surprised. After all, Israeli historian Yehuda Bauer told the *Associated Press* (as reported in *The* (Portland) *Oregonian* on December 21, 1988) that, “Every politician today is using the Holocaust to back his political agenda.”

In fact, there is no question that “the Holocaust” has become a powerful political tool for the state of Israel in the global arena. On April 24, 1998, speaking at a memorial ceremony at Auschwitz, Israeli Prime Minister Binyamin Netanyahu made it clear that he would never let the United States—or the world—forget about “the Holocaust.” He also made it clear that yes, even the United States, which intervened in the European war to stop Hitler—was also responsible for “the Holocaust.” According to the Israeli prime minister, “All that was needed was to bomb the train tracks. The Allies bombed targets nearby. The pilots only had to nudge their cross hairs. You think they didn’t know? They knew. They didn’t bomb because at that time, the Jews didn’t have a state, nor the military and political force to protect themselves.”

In short, if one believes that the Nazis were indeed engaged in a program of mass extermination—mass gassings—at Auschwitz, then the Allies knowingly let Jews die.

This will come as no small surprise to millions of U.S. veterans of World War II who risked their lives to save the Jews of Europe from the clutches of Hitler. This allegation will also prove rather thought-provoking to many more millions of Americans who saw their fathers and sons die in that tragic war. However, we are now told, because Hitler killed six million Jews and because the Allies left them to die, it is the duty of every non-Jew living on the face of this planet to pay penance to the state of Israel—the tiny nation that “rose from the ashes of the Holocaust.”

Therefore, it was almost inevitable that the issue of “the Holocaust” would somehow be brought into the debate—or non-debate, as the case may be—over the thesis of my book, one which dares to say something less than pleasant about Israel.

So, in the end, thanks to “the Holocaust” issue, this college seminar on the JFK assassination was canceled and I never got to speak either about the book or, dare I say, about the Holocaust. But these allegations of “Holocaust denial” have given me pause to think about that subject—and I suppose I have the ADL to thank for that.

In fact, the first I learned about the ADL’s allegation that I was a “Holocaust denier” was when a breathless young reporter from the *Los Angeles Times* contacted me and began quizzing me on the subject of the Holocaust.

Right up front, I told the reporter this: “First of all, my book is about the JFK assassination. It has nothing to do with the Holocaust. The JFK assassination took place in 1963. The Holocaust ended in 1945. My views on what did or did not take place during the Holocaust have nothing to do with my book on the JFK assassination. It is another subject altogether.”

But the reporter was relentless. “Well,” he asked, “what are your views on the Holocaust?” I told him that I had very little interest in the subject but, as a consequence of a seemingly unending stream of media reports, new books, television and film dramas, and other media “events,” it was virtually impossible for anyone in the modern world not to have heard about the subject. But that didn’t satisfy the reporter, and when all was said and done, he reported in the pages of the *Los Angeles Times* the following: “As for his views on the Holocaust, Piper said he disputed the figure that 6 million Jews died at the hands of the Nazis, alluding to claims that the figure is actually much lower and that no Jews were killed in gas chambers.”

First of all, the *Los Angeles Times* lied. I made no reference to allegations that no Jews were killed in gas chambers. In fact, not

once did the phrase “gas chambers” ever pass my lips. And I did *not* say, as the *Times* further reported, that I disputed the much-reported figure that “six million Jews” died at the hands of the Nazis. Instead, when asked if I doubted the “Six Million” figure, I told him that there were new claims (emanating from Jewish sources) that the figure was much higher than the vaunted “Six Million.”

“As far as the numbers are concerned,” I told him, “I have heard the figure of Six Million all of my life. You can’t turn around without reading something about it in the press all of the time. However,” I added, “in recent years, some Jewish historians have claimed that the figure is as high as seven million or even eight million. So I don’t know what the figure is.” I wasn’t there. It happened—whatever happened—at least 15 years before I was born, and several thousand miles away from the small town in America where I was raised!

I referred the reporter to the *Washington Post* of November 20, 1996; the issue of the highly-reputable *Jerusalem Post* for the week ending November 23, 1996; and the May 23-May 30, 1997 edition of the New York-based *Jewish Press*—all of which reported that the figure of the number of Jewish victims of the Holocaust had now been inflated (by Jewish sources) to at least seven million—maybe more. But the *Los Angeles Times*—doing the bidding of the ADL—did not report that since, of course, it didn’t go along with the propaganda line they were attempting to promote.

So even though the *Times* was obsessed with the Holocaust, they never reported what I really had to say on that much-discussed subject, although they did gratuitously add that one Jewish-American author, Gerald Posner, who has written a book on the Holocaust (as well as a much-promoted book saying that there was no conspiracy behind the JFK assassination), said that my particular JFK conspiracy thesis—that Israel’s Mossad was involved—was “similar to the notion that the Holocaust was a hoax.” (There’s that old Holocaust again!)

But it is quite interesting indeed, inasmuch as—until recently—the ADL claimed that “Holocaust denial” was “denying that the Holocaust ever took place,” the ADL is careful to say that the so-called “denial” movement disputes details about the Holocaust, such as, for example, the actual number of Jews who died. Yet, despite all this—despite the growing number of press reports about the actual numbers of those who did die, the continuing rant about “Holocaust denial” continues.

And while I was busy fending off the media’s inquiries about where I stood on the question of the Holocaust—as though I were somehow required to take a stand—here’s something else I hastened to point out: My father and three of his brothers were involved in Holocaust rescue activities during World War II. That is, they were members of the U.S. military. Two Piper boys were in the U.S. Army, one was a Navy pilot, and my father was a U.S. Marine who saw fierce combat in the Pacific. They laid their lives on the line to fight Nazi Germany and Imperial Japan and put an end to what we know now as “the Holocaust.” My father contracted malaria and spent months in a veterans hospital recovering. The other three were luckier

In any case, my poor grandmother sent her four boys off to the far ends of the earth and spent two years living alone and wondering whether they would ever come home alive. I remember being frightened and distressed as a small child when my father once said to me, “Just think about poor Nina (my grandmother) and how she had to sit here in this big old house alone at nights and worry about her boys.”

I can still recall (even though he was there with me) the terror of thinking about my father being butchered in the jungles of Asia. I can remember seeing a famous and very horrifying photograph of a captured Australian pilot about to be decapitated by

the Japanese and thinking: "That could have been Dad." So I grew up very conscious of the evils of war and its consequences.

Like many American veterans of World War II, my father was a devoted admirer of Franklin Roosevelt, having once stood as a proud Marine on review within spitting distance of FDR and his little dog Fala. That was probably his most cherished memory.

But although FDR wrote nothing, my widely-read father spent much of his free time studying the wartime memoirs of Winston Churchill and the writings of William Shirer and all the other "approved" standards on the subject.

I can recall (while I was still a schoolboy) my father showing me the world-famous photo of a frightened little Jewish boy with his arms raised in terror as a Nazi soldier holds him at gunpoint. "This is what those dirty Nazis did to the Jews," my father would say repeatedly. I must have seen that picture at least ten times, accompanied by his commentary.

However, as I learned years later, three different Jewish "Holocaust survivors" got involved in an ugly skunk-fight over who was really the "little Jewish boy gassed by the Nazis." Whatever the case, the ever-authoritative *New York Times* (which lately I've taken to calling "Holocaust Update") reported on May 28, 1982 that "some individuals, convinced that the symbolic power of the picture would be diminished were the boy shown to have survived, refuse to consider [those claims] at all."

In any event, by the time his all-too short life came to an end in 1990, my father had begun to have second thoughts about the Holocaust. In my last conversation with my father—just several hours before he died on July 21, 1990, I mentioned to him (trying to distract both of us from his very real suffering) that I had just read an article from the *London Daily Telegraph*, reprinted in the *Washington Times* on July 17, which stated that:

Poland has cut its estimate of the number of people killed by the Nazis in the Auschwitz death camp from 4 million to just over 1 million ... The

new study could rekindle the controversy over the scale of Hitler's 'final solution' ...

Franciszek Piper, director of the historical committee of the Auschwitz-Birkenau Museum, said yesterday that, according to recent research, at least 1.3 million people were deported to the camp, of whom about 223,000 survived.

The 1.1 million victims included 960,000 Jews, between 70,000 and 75,000 Poles, nearly all of the 23,000 Gypsies sent to the camp, and 15,000 Soviet prisoners of war.

Shmuel Krakowsky, head of research at Israel's Yad Vashem memorial for Jewish victims of the Holocaust, said the new Polish figures were correct. 'The four million figure was let slip by Capt. Rudolf Hoess, the death camp's Nazi commander. Some have bought it, but it was exaggerated ...'

Plaques commemorating the deaths of four million victims were removed from the Auschwitz museum earlier this month.

I found this detail of history quite intriguing, since, after all, I recalled reading in one of my high school history books that of the six million Jews who had died during the Holocaust; fully four million of them had died at Auschwitz alone.

So, although I have never been much of a mathematician, I was still able to figure out that if the newly-emerging facts were indeed correct, the actual number of Jews who had died during the Holocaust had to be considerably less than the much-talked-about figure of "Six Million."

Put simply: if you subtract the former "four million Jews dead at Auschwitz" from the popular "Six Million," that leaves two million Jews dead. And if, as the authorities at Auschwitz are now saying, only 960,000 died there, that means that 1,040,000 died elsewhere.

Perhaps my memory was faulty. Perhaps what I had instead

read in my high school books was incorrect. But I did a little research and learned (thanks to an ADL special report on the subject) that on April 18, 1945 the *New York Times* reported that four million people died at Auschwitz. And this “fact” was reported over and over again during the next 50 years without question—including, it seems, in my own high school history book.

However, in commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the liberation of Auschwitz, both the *Washington Post* and the *New York Times* itself—reported on January 26, 1995 that the Polish authorities had determined that, at most, 1.5 million people (of all races and religions)—not “four million”—died at Auschwitz of all causes, including natural causes—most notably starvation and disease, a report echoing that earlier *London Sunday Times* report of five years earlier.

Even more recently, so esteemed an authority on the Holocaust as Walter Reich, former director of the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum in Washington from 1995 to 1998, has entered what we might call “the numbers debate.”

On September 8, 1998—right about the time that I was seeing yet another account in the California media about my being a “Holocaust denier”—the *Washington Post* published an article by Reich in which he addressed the conflict between Jewish groups and a group of Polish Catholics who wanted to place crosses in memorial of the Christians who died at Auschwitz.

Reich was responding to what he described as a “well-meaning” August 31, 1998 editorial in the *Post* about the brouhaha. Reich made an interesting comment that the editorial “illustrates how old fictions about Auschwitz have been accepted as facts—fictions that have been used repeatedly to distort the camp’s history.” (Evidently, the *Post’s* editorial writers had not seen the report on the Auschwitz numbers that had been published three years previously and chose, instead, to repeat “old fictions ... accepted as facts.”

What were those “old fictions ... accepted as facts”? (And by

the way, if I had used the term “old fictions” in reference to Auschwitz, the ADL would certainly have called me a “Holocaust denier”) In any case, here’s what Reich had to say:

The *Post* identified Auschwitz-Birkinau as the death camp ‘where three million Jews and millions of others were murdered by the Nazis.’ Recent scholarship by a Polish historian has put the number of deaths there conservatively at about 1.1 million, with other estimates ranging to about 1.5 million. Approximately 90 percent of the dead were Jews.

The *Post*’s numbers may have been derived in part from the inflated estimate—originally of Soviet origin and endorsed by Polish authorities after the war—of about four million dead. This number, and other numbers of similar magnitude, were repeated so often that they came to be accepted by many as true, even though historians in Poland and elsewhere have revised this number down considerably.

For some in Poland, the larger numbers were embraced because they emphasized Polish suffering in Auschwitz during the German occupation: The larger the total number of victims, the larger the number who must have been Catholic Poles. Scholarship in recent years has put the number of Polish dead in Auschwitz at less than 100,000—many fewer than were originally said to have died there; but by any standard a tragically large number, eternally marking Auschwitz as a place of Polish national loss.

Now in light of all the trouble that I got into with the ADL’s literary shills at the *Los Angeles Times* over the question of “numbers,” I can’t help but find Reich’s revelations most enlightening—and revealing. Frankly, I can’t find any problem whatsoever with Reich’s concluding comments about Auschwitz and “the

Holocaust”: “Let there be only words of accurate history in that kingdom of boundless evil.”

Honest people find no problem with Reich’s call (in the essay) for “only words of accurate history” in reportage about Auschwitz. Today, a major first step toward “only words of accurate history” is the release of a new anthology on Auschwitz, assembled by English writer Vivian Bird.

Auschwitz: The Final Count examines “new” reports in the mainstream media (outlined above) and provides essential additional facts that must be considered in order for the full story of Auschwitz to finally be told. Bird’s 109-page book is a compendium (supplemented with commentary by Bird) of four complete, previously published works relating to Auschwitz and the Holocaust.

The book features a fascinating introduction by Bird exploring the little-known but thoroughly documented phenomenon in which the numbers of the official Auschwitz “death toll” have plummeted from a “high” of 9,000,000 dead to a rock bottom of 73,137 (of whom 38,031 were Jews). And readers will note that of the 26 widely varying figures cited by Bird, all come from a variety of “responsible” and mainstream sources. No figure Bird cites comes from any source accused of “denying the Holocaust,” whatever that means.

Clearly, the number of people who died at Auschwitz is central to understanding what happened there. But the figures keep changing. If Bird’s book proves anything, it proves that.

However, there’s much more to Auschwitz than the changing numbers. The essays in Bird’s volume each provide a uniquely different facet to the overall problem:

- *The Auschwitz Lie* by Thies Christophersen is an insider’s view of Auschwitz. The German author, an agrarian, was sent to Auschwitz not as an inmate, but as a scientist researching the development of synthetic rubber. Working side-by-side with inmate staff, Christophersen saw, firsthand, day-to-day life at

Auschwitz and, in postwar years, was astounded to hear the stories of “gassings” and all the tall tales that we today associate with Auschwitz.

His essay, *The Auschwitz Lie*, first published in German in 1973, caused great consternation. However, Christophersen would not back down, and, as a consequence, he was variously fined or imprisoned for daring to tell his eyewitness account. Those accustomed to “docu-drama” renditions of Auschwitz will find a new perspective in Christophersen’s report.

- *Zyklon B, Auschwitz, and the Trial of Dr. Bruno Tesch* is the second feature in Bird’s anthology. Written by a veteran chemist, the late Dr. William Lindsey, this is a carefully documented demolition of the war crimes trial of Dr. Tesch, who was ultimately convicted and hanged. The unfortunate Tesch was co-owner of a company which bought in bulk (from the manufacturers) and then supplied (as the middleman) to the German concentration camp authorities the now-infamous Zyklon B pesticide.

Although we have been told Zyklon B was used to gas millions of Jews to death, Lindsey shows that the compound was used as an insecticide and disinfectant to delouse not only the Auschwitz inmates, but also SS members running the camp, and to fumigate their clothes, bunkhouses etc. Zyklon B, in short, was used to maintain and sustain human life—not to end it. Lindsey’s essay examines the fraudulent evidence and testimony in the Tesch trial and eviscerates another critical element of not only the Auschwitz legend, but of the Holocaust story as a whole.

- *Inside the Auschwitz “Gas Chambers”* is by Fred A. Leuchter, a spunky American engineer once known as perhaps the foremost U.S. authority on the mechanics of judicial execution. Leuchter describes how he conducted scientific experiments on the structures at Auschwitz that court historians say were used to exterminate vast numbers of people—the infamous gas chambers. Leuchter concluded no such gassings could have ever taken place as the official story describes. For daring to present

his findings—the only known such study carried out at the gas chambers—Leuchter was relentlessly harassed. But his point was made. His findings cut right to the core of the matter of Auschwitz.

- The final essay is *Why Is “The Holocaust” Important?* written by TBR publisher Willis A. Carto, who points out that the Holocaust has become a lucrative industry unto itself, used as a highly effective political tool to not only extort billions of German and American taxpayer dollars to Israel, but also to force the United States to conduct its foreign policy in a fashion beneficial to Tel Aviv (and contrary to U.S. national interests). Carto’s essay puts the Holocaust in perspective.

Thus, there’s clearly much more to the story of Auschwitz and the Holocaust than meets the eye. The facts assembled paint a perhaps much more interesting story about what really did happen.

Bird’s book will, in many ways, serve as the final judgment on this subject. *Auschwitz: The Final Count* will outrage many—but as Bird puts it: “For those who care to investigate the facts—not the myths—about the events of World War II, this volume should put at least some of the major legends of the Holocaust to rest.”

So much then for the truth about Auschwitz ... The numbers game has come full circle and, as the old saying goes, truth will out. But the stories about Auschwitz are not the only “old fictions ... accepted as facts” that are now being corrected in light of efforts to bring history into accord with the facts.

I know, for example, that one of my beloved high school teachers—the late Lucy Buck Lehman, whose integrity was unquestionable—once told me of the horrors that she experienced as a Red Cross volunteer when she served at the Dachau concentration camp in Germany at the end of World War II. She told me, with great emotion: “I saw what happened. I saw the gas chamber at Dachau where they gassed thousands of Jews. There’s no denying the Holocaust.” This teacher was among those who saw the gas chamber that was displayed to hundreds (perhaps

thousands) of Americans who passed through the camp at the end of the war.

Yet, years later I learned that on August 19, 1960, historian Dr. Martin Broszat, writing in Hamburg's weekly *Die Zeit*, had already reported that: "Neither in Dachau nor in Bergen-Belsen nor in Buchenwald were Jews or other prisoners gassed. The gas chamber in Dachau was never entirely finished or put 'into operation.' Hundreds of thousands of prisoners who perished in Dachau and other concentration camps in the Old Reich were victims, above all, of the catastrophic hygienic and provisioning conditions ..."

For his own part, post-war Nazi-hunter Simon Wiesenthal said in a letter in (January 24, 1993) in the European edition of *Stars and Stripes* that: "It is true that there were no extermination camps on German soil ... A gas chamber was in the process of being built at Dachau, but it was never completed."

In 1995 the American Jewish Committee (AJC) reported in *The Changing Shape of Holocaust Memory* that "there were no killing centers per se in Germany . . . [and] as horrifying as the conditions were at Dachau, its gas chamber was never used ..."

So although there was a "gas chamber" at Dachau—evidently the one that my high school teacher saw—it was never, in fact, used for the purposes that she believed.

The bottom line, I suppose, is this: there's much more to the story of "the Holocaust" than meets the eye, and if anything, all of the facts taken together paint a much more interesting story about what did—and didn't happen—and, more importantly, how "old fictions ... accepted as facts" are being used to prop up a lucrative propaganda industry not only in the United States, but throughout the world: the so-called "Shoah" business.

The question of whether or not one believes that "Six Million Jews Died During the Holocaust" now seems to have become the ultimate litmus test of respectability. How long, I ask, in all sincerity—will it be before Americans have to swear their allegiance

to that article of faith?

The linkage of the JFK assassination to the Holocaust in the media frenzy over my book is rather ironic. It is actually just another “numbers game.” The “official” story on the JFK assassination is that one assassin fired three shots at the president—but we now know that more than one assassin fired more than three shots. Critical research into the JFK assassination conspiracy effectively inflated the numbers. In the case of the “official” story on “the Holocaust,” critical research (based upon the facts) has, quite the reverse, deflated the numbers. We now know that six million Jews did not die during the Holocaust.

And there’s much more about our “memory” regarding the Holocaust that is not precisely what we “know” to be the truth. Americans have been told that World War II was a fight for the survival of the “Judeo-Christian tradition.”

However, in his book, *The Holocaust in American Life*, Professor Peter Novick of the University of Chicago reveals—a ground-breaking historical first—that the now popular catchphrase referring to “the Judeo-Christian tradition” was a product of wartime propaganda concocted for political purposes, and had no foundation in historical reality or in the annals of either Jewish or Christian teaching.

According to Novick, “It was during the Hitler years that American philo-Semites invented the ‘Judeo-Christian tradition’ to combat innocent, or not so innocent, language that spoke of a totalitarian assault on ‘Christian civilization.’ In short, the term was invented for the very purpose of disposing of the concept that there was any such thing as “Christian civilization” in the first place.

Even during wartime, Novick points out, the official American government (and Jewish community) propaganda against the Germans downplayed German treatment of the Jews. In fact, according to Novick, the Anti-Defamation League (ADL) of B’nai B’rith was very much fearful that Jews would be blamed by Americans for the war. Immediately after Pearl Harbor, the direc-

tor of the ADL warned that, “There will be hundreds of thousands of bereaved families, a substantial part of whom have been conditioned to the belief that this is a Jewish war.”

Novick revealed that Leo Rosten—a Jewish writer who headed the Office of War Information’s special anti-German propaganda division known as the “Nature of the Enemy” department—was fearful of putting too much emphasis on Nazi atrocities against Jews. Rosten and the Jewish leadership perceived that there was so much anti-Semitism in the ranks of the U.S. Army that the result would be that U.S. soldiers might be sympathetic to the Germans.

According to Rosten: “The impression on the average American is much stronger if the question [of fighting Hitler and the Nazis] is not exclusively Jewish.” With that in mind, according to Novick, U.S. propagandists were directed to show that the Nazis were “everyone’s enemy, to broaden rather than narrow the range of Nazi victims.”

In short, coming full circle, the phrase “Judeo-Christian tradition” was no more than wartime propaganda. The concept is a fraud that has nothing whatsoever to do with any theological teaching, popular modern-day perception notwithstanding—a detail that casts a new light on a much-abused turn of phrase that is practically obligatory in all public pronouncements that dare to touch on the otherwise verboten subject of religion.

So although the American Jewish community—and Novick doesn’t say this—has played a major role in fighting traditional American displays of religious devotion, the invented concept of “the Judeo-Christian tradition” has still been a useful propaganda tool in perpetuating the story of the Holocaust.

And contrary to what you may have been told, immediately following World War II, survivors of the Holocaust were not held in as high esteem (even by the Jewish establishment) as they are today. Today, as Novick points out, those who survived the war—particularly those who spent time in the concentration camps—

have been elevated to a special status. But immediately after the war, as Novick notes, the attitude toward the survivors was not quite the same.

- Jewish writer Samuel Lubell, writing in *The Saturday Evening Post* of October 5, 1946, said that “It was a survival not of the fittest, not of the most high-minded or reasonable and certainly not of the meekest, but of the toughest.”

- According to one Jewish official, “Often, it was the ‘ex-ghetto’ elements rather than the upper class or white collar groups who survived ... the petty thief or leader of petty thieves who offered leadership to others, or developed techniques of survival.”

- A top leader of the American Jewish Committee wrote that, “Those who have survived are not the fittest ... but are largely the lowest Jewish elements, who by cunning and animal instincts have been able to escape the terrible fate of the more refined and better elements, who succumbed.”

- David Sh’altiel, a future Israeli general, commented that “Those who survived lived because they were egotistical and looked out, first and foremost, for themselves.”

- David Ben-Gurion, the founding father of Israel, himself said that the survivors included, “People who would not have survived if they had not been what they were—hard, evil and selfish people, and what they underwent there served to destroy what good qualities they had left.”

Novick says that these perceptions, however negative, faded with time, but the fact is that these were the perceptions at the time—and not something that we hear much about today.

Right-thinking people of all persuasions agree with what the late Israeli Prime Minister, Yitzhak Rabin, said in 1995 when he rejected calls for an investigation into long-suppressed Israeli war crimes against Christian and Muslim Palestinian political prisoners: “There is no purpose in raising events of the past—not on our side and not on theirs.”

Rabin was right. His words can also be applied to the subject

of the Holocaust. To repeat: “There is no purpose in raising events of the past—not on our side and not on theirs.”

We’ve heard *all* we need to hear from the Holocaust promoters, and we know what they have to say. Their message is so pervading, so ever-present—in books, newspapers, television, and radio—that it has been virtually impossible to escape the Holocaust in American life.

For my own part, I don’t frankly care whether or not a handful of people are outraged that I don’t share their agony about the events of the Holocaust—because I don’t. And I will not be extorted into saying that I do, simply to avoid being labeled with the tarbrush of “Holocaust denial.” I bear no guilt. I bear no shame. Let it be said: “I’m tired of hearing about the Holocaust.”

As an American of American Indian heritage—one whose own forebears suffered a very real Holocaust and whose own ethnic kin continue to suffer today in concentration camps known as “reservations”—I find it hard to sympathize with American Jews who, while railing about the tragedies of World War II—now constitute the most powerful group on the face of the entire planet today.

For me, there are no restless nights worrying about the Six Million or the Seven Million or the Forty Million, whatever the current “favorite” number of Holocaust victims happens to be. Nor will I be bothered by what Jewish writer Sylvia Tennenbaum has referred to as a “psychic disturbance” that has seemed to overcome those who are, in her words, now tending to “wallow in vicarious fantasies” about the subject—something that another Jewish writer, caustically (and rightly on target) described as a “necrophilic obsession”.

Dr. Alfred Lilienthal, a pioneer American Jewish critic of Israel, has said that the Holocaust is “a cult, and the reigning cult” among those obsessed with Israel. Jewish dissenter Leon Wieseltier, the son of Holocaust survivors, has also said as much, frankly declaring that the centrality of the Holocaust for American Jews “amounts virtually to a cult of death.”

Wieseltier dares to wonder how many American Jews “know anything about the Jewish medieval poets, the wealth of the culture, the Jewish philosophers?”

As a result of the work of honest researchers who have brought forth new facts and swept aside the myths of the past, we can move forward into the 21st century by wiping the Holocaust from the slate of historical debate and begin anew.

The Holocaust is over. No more Holocaust. Enough is enough.

CHAPTER FIVE

Zionism Moves Against the United Nations

The United Nations (UN) has been shelved, sidelined, consigned to the trash heap—at least temporarily—by the one-world dreamers who once saw the global body as the means of establishing a world hegemon.

Today's imperialists—standard bearers for an ancient philosophy hostile to all forms of nationalism other than their own—now envision the United States as the driving force to implement the New World Order of which they have dreamed for generations. The United States is their “New Jerusalem” and they intend to use America's military might to achieve their aims.

For nearly 50 years, the major media in America told Americans—and people around the globe—that the UN was “the last best hope for mankind.” That theme was a ritualistic mantra in American public schools. Anyone who dared criticize the UN was marginalized—damned as an “extremist” hostile to humanity itself.

However, in the 1970s, things began to change. As Third World nations emerged from their colonial status, and as Israel's oppression of the Christian and Muslim people of Palestinian-Arab heritage became a topic of worldwide concern, the UN took on a new complexion—at least as far as the media monopoly in America was concerned. Suddenly, the UN was no longer considered such a wonderful thing after all.

Finally, when—in 1975—the UN passed its historic resolution condemning Zionism as a form of racism, the wheel turned full circle. For issuing a direct challenge to Zionism, the foundation behind the establishment in 1948 of the State of Israel (as well as a spiritual capital of an impending worldwide Zionist empire), the UN was painted by the media—much of it in the hands of Zionist families and finan-

cial interests—as an unquestioned villain.

Suddenly, criticism of the UN was quite “respectable.” And in the United States, an emerging so-called “neo-conservative” movement—led by a tightly-knit clique of Jewish ex-Trotskyite communists under the tutelage of one Irving Kristol and his acolyte, Norman Podhoretz, editor of the American Jewish Committee’s highly influential monthly journal, *Commentary*—made the burgeoning attack on the UN a centerpiece of its agenda.

However, it was not until the ascension to power in January, 2001 of President George W. Bush’s administration that the effort to “get the U.S. out of the UN and the UN out of the U.S.” (or variants thereof) became part of the actual policy-making framework in official Washington.

The appropriation of the American national security establishment by a host of neo-conservatives appointed to office by Bush—every single one of them, to a man, proteges of the aforementioned Irving Kristol and his son, William Kristol, a powerful media commentator and behind-the-scenes policy maker in his own right—assured that the campaign against the UN would be central to Bush administration policy.

In addition, of course, the anti-UN rhetoric received increasingly even more widespread support throughout the American media. For example, writing in *The New York Post*, a journal published by Mortimer Zuckerman, the former president of the Conference of Presidents of Major American Jewish Organizations (the governing body of the American Zionist movement), one columnist, Andrea Peyser, referred to “the anti-American, anti-Semitic rats infesting the banks of the East River.”

Should anyone still doubt that the reason for opposition to the UN stemmed from the fact that the world body stood in the way of the demands of Israel, note the revealing commentary by Cal Thomas, a long-time associate of Rev. Jerry Falwell, one of the most vociferous advocates for Israel in America today.

In a Dec. 12, 2004 column for *The Washington Times*, Thomas

endorsed long-time criticisms of the UN which he—by his own admission—previously considered the work of “the fringe.” Thomas said that “the world would be better off without this body.” Noting that many Americans never felt the UN would be good for America, Thomas asserted that he always felt that those who said such things were to be ignored. Here’s what Thomas wrote:

In college days, I was aware of them. They were the fringe, and beyond, who believed fluoridation of the public water supply was a communist plot to poison us; Dwight Eisenhower was a closet communist; the Trilateral Commission and Council on Foreign Relations were part of the drive for “one world government”; Jewish bankers ran the world economy, and the United States should get out of the United Nations.

According to Thomas: “Without buying into the paranoia and conspiracy theories, I am now a convert to the last one.” Thomas’s assertion in this regard is a candid exposition of the Zionist lobby’s attitude toward the UN, now that the world body has very clearly fallen out of the hands of the Zionist movement and is considered, in their view, “un-manageable” or “beyond repair,” so to speak.

In fact, there is absolutely no question whatsoever that the Zionists do indeed perceive the United States as the new mechanism by which they seek to accomplish their goals, pushing the UN to the sidelines.

The grand scheme for a New World Order—in the wake of America’s new “imperial” role—was imparted quite directly in a major two-part policy paper in the Summer 2003 and Winter 2004 issues of *The Journal of International Security Affairs*, voice of the definitively influential Jewish Institute for National Security Policy (JINSA).

Previously a little-known Washington think tank, JINSA is

now often publicly acknowledged as the guiding force behind Bush foreign policy today. One JINSA critic, Professor Edward Herman, has even gone so far as to describe JINSA as “a virtual agency of the Israeli government.”

The author of the JINSA paper, Alexander H. Joffe, a pro-Israel academic, has been a regularly featured writer in JINSA’s journal, certainly reflecting the high regard in which his views are held by the Zionist elite. His two-part series was entitled, *The Empire That Dared Not Speak Its Name*, propounding the theme that “America is an empire,” suggesting that, yes, this is a very good thing.

The new global regime to be established would find America as “the center of a new international system” in “a world that looks like America, and is therefore safe for all.” However, what America “looks like” is what the Zionists want it to look like—not necessarily what the American people perceive America to be.

Joffe stated flatly that: “The end of the General Assembly as a credible body may plausibly be ascribed to the infamous ‘Zionism is Racism’ resolution in 1975,” (which, incidentally, has since been repealed). The JINSA author contended that the world should be “grateful” that the UN has been “discredited, reduced to farce and ultimately ground to a halt.”

As a result of the UN being shelved as a world government vehicle, wrote Joffe, “We now have the opportunity, and obligation, to begin again.” However, he warned that even the emerging European Union (EU) is a threat to the dream of a global empire (at least, obviously, in the view of the Zionist movement).

The JINSA writer asserted that the EU is an “alternative vision for the international community,” one that, as he put it frankly, is “the authentic counter-vision to an American Empire.” According to Joffe, the biggest problem with Europe and the EU is that “culture remains at the core of Europe’s problems. Nationalism was a doctrine born in Europe, as were its vicious mutant offspring: fascism and communism.” (A fervent advocate

of Israeli super-nationalism, the writer doesn't seem to see the logic in his attack on other peoples' nationalism.)

Joffe complained that although "the new European Empire is multicultural in theory ... in reality it is dominated politically and culturally by France and economically by Germany." Today, in the EU, he said, "Driven by a sense of postcolonial guilt and postwar ennui, the door has been thrown open to all ideas. At the most sinister levels it has permitted and even legitimized a vast explosion of unhinged thought and action, namely anti-Americanism, anti-Semitism, and a wide variety of conspiracy theories."

In any case, what Joffe described as "the other kind of liberal internationalism" is what the Zionist movement favors. Joffe defined it as such:

Given our history and our values, that future lies in leveraging the American Empire in such a way that it becomes the basis of a new democratic international system.

In the second-part of his extended essay, published in the winter 2004 issue of JINSA's journal, Joffe pursued this further, expanding on his call for what he described as "an empire that looks like America."

Yet, in spite of his rhetoric about "democracy," Joffe frankly talked about the United States engaging in massive imperial conquests in the trouble-torn regions of Africa—presumably after the United States has already made havoc in the Arab countries of the Middle East:

The conditions under which America and its allies would simply take over and restore African countries are far from clear. What are the thresholds for intervention? What are the procedures and outcomes? Who will fight and who will pay? The restoration of Africa would involve long-term com-

mitments and immense costs, of the sort that could only be paid for by Africa itself. That is to say, it would probably require American economic control to go along with political and cultural control. Colonialism is always pay as you go, and it is not pretty. The question is both whether Africa can pay the price (or afford not to), and whether America has the stomach.

Of course, Africa is not the only target of Joffe and his like-minded schemers. Joffe wrote of a wide-ranging global agenda—well beyond the African continent. In the end, however, Joffe let the cat out of the bag about the real intentions of those who are using United States military power as the mechanism for a bigger agenda.

“New arrangements,” he said, “must come into being under American leadership to provide an alternative for states that are willing to accept rights and responsibilities.” Joffe dreams of a United Nations that has been re-made under the imperial force of the United States. And ultimately, he predicts the possibility of a world government, writing:

Possibly, after a period of chaos and anger, which in any event would simply intensify existing states of being, the institution [the United Nations] might be *bludgeoned* into changing. [emphasis added]

Rather than a club that admits all, the 21st century United Nations might—someday, somehow—be remade into an exclusive, by invitation, members-only group, of free, democratic states, sharing similar values. Or in the end, replaced by one. That day, however, may be decades off.

Should there be any doubt that he is talking about world government, note Joffe’s concluding words:

The best way to preserve the American empire is to eventually give it up. Setting the stage for

global governance can only be done with American leadership and American-led institutions of the sort schematically outlined here.

What it all comes down to is the use of America's military power to advance another (secret) agenda altogether. Here, in the pages of a Zionist journal, we have learned precisely what the "story behind the story" actually is. It has nothing to do, even with a "strong America" or, for that matter, even with America itself. The United States is simply a pawn—albeit a powerful one—in the game, being ruthlessly shifted about in a scheme for world dominance by an elite few operating behind the scenes.

Further evidence that this is indeed the view of the Zionist movement comes from no less a source than Israel's former ambassador to the UN, Dore Gold. In his 2004 book, *Tower of Babble: How the United Nations Has Fueled Global Chaos*, Gold outlined a scenario for a new global regime—under United States diktat—pushing aside the UN. He wrote:

The United States and its Western allies won the Cold War but obviously no longer have the common goal of containing Soviet expansionism as the glue holding together a coalition. Still, a coalition of allies could start with neutralizing the greatest threat to international peace today: global terrorism, another threat that the UN has failed to counter effectively ...

The issue of terrorism relates to a number of other concerns common to all of these nations: the spread of weapons of mass destruction, the proliferation of sensitive military technologies, terrorist financing and money laundering, and the incitement of ethnic hatred and violence in national media as well as in educational institutions. Their commitment to curtailing these threats would lead democracies around the world to join together and take action ...

Such a democratic coalition would be far more representative of the national will of each country's citizens than the UN currently is. Oddly, by going outside the UN, these countries would be recommitting themselves to the principles of which the UN was originally founded. They would embrace the principles laid out in the UN Charter and insist that members of the coalition fully adhere—not just give lip service—to a basic code of international conduct ...

In short, while Gold and his Zionist allies see global government worthy of support, they do not see the UN as the means by which to achieve it. Gold elaborated further, describing a new mechanism for achieving a New World Order:

Because the UN has lost the moral clarity of its founders, the United States and its allies must take the lead. The world will follow in time. If more than one hundred nations wanted to join the Community of Democracies, the democratic ideal must be powerful.

In fact, although it was not widely noticed at the time, a so-called “Community of Democracies” was inaugurated by the Clinton administration's Secretary of State Madeleine Albright in June, 2000. So the mechanism is already in place. Gold concluded that the United States and its allies might ultimately “reinvigorate the UN and make the organization's system of collective security,” but, he added, “That day is a long way off.”

In the meantime, media voices for the Israeli lobby have promoted Gold's concept of what might be described as a “parallel” UN under the domination of the United States and its purported allies.

For example, on February 6, 2005 writing in *The Washington Times*, Clifford D. May raised this question: “Is it not high time at least to consider alternatives to the United Nations, to explore

possibly developing new organizations in which democratic societies would work together against common enemies and for common goals?”

However, the evidence is indisputable that this is not just the Zionist propaganda line. This philosophy directs the thinking of the Bush administration. When President George Bush made his call for a worldwide “democratic” revolution in his second inaugural address, he was doing little more than echoing the opinions of Israeli cabinet minister Natan Sharansky, an influential figure who is considered more hard-line than even Israel’s ruling premier, Ariel Sharon.

Not only did Bush publicly and warmly endorse Sharansky, but media reports revealed that Sharansky played a major part in helping draft Bush’s inaugural address.

This is particularly relevant in the context of Sharansky’s harsh words for the UN and what he has offered in his own work, *The Case for Democracy*, widely touted as “the bible” of Bush foreign policy. In the closing pages of his book, Sharansky summed it up:

To protect and promote democracy around the world, I believe that a new international institution, one in which only those governments who give their people the right to be heard and counted, will themselves have a right to be heard and counted can be an enormously important force for democratic change ... This community of free nations will not emerge on its own ... I am convinced that a successful effort to expand freedom around the world must be inspired and led by the United States.

So it is once again: the concept of the United States being the force for global realignment. And although there was worldwide criticism—even from so-called “democracies”—of Bush’s call for worldwide democratic revolution based on the Sharansky model, the American Jewish newspaper, *Forward*, noted on January 28,

2005 that “one world leader endorsed Bush’s approach unreservedly”—former Israeli Prime Minister (and current finance minister) Benjamin Netanyahu. Citing a speech the Israeli leader recently gave in Florida, *Forward* said Netanyahu proclaimed:

President Bush called for democratization and he’s on to something very profound. Can the Arab world be democratized? Yes—slowly, painfully. And who can democratize it? As in everywhere else in the world, in all societies, whether it’s Latin America, the former Soviet Union, or South Africa, democracy was always achieved by outside pressure. And who delivered that pressure? One country: the U.S.

To say more would belabor this simple conclusion: Although, for years, the Zionists denounced American patriots for saying that it was time to “Get the U.S. out of the UN and the UN out of the U.S.,” now that the Zionists have lost control of the UN—which they originally perceived as their vehicle for establishing a New World Order—the Zionists are targeting the UN precisely because they have determined that the military and financial resources of the United States are their best bet for establishing that New World Order of which they long dreamed. The Zionists want the United States to serve as the engine for assembling a world empire under their control.

In the end, this does tell us who “The High Priests of War” are and what their agenda really is. Remaining to be seen is what the American people—and all other real patriots around the globe—intend to do about it. The question is this: will the world finally decide that it *is* time to declare war against The High Priests of War?

CHAPTER SIX

Israel & Islamic Fundamentalism

Why would Israel provide covert support for Islamic fundamentalist extremists? What interests do the Israelis and Osama bin Laden have in common? The answer to these provocative questions points toward a dirty little secret that the major media in America is keeping under wraps.

As hard as it may be for the average American to digest, there is a solid record of evidence pointing toward a long-time—albeit little-known—role by Israel’s intelligence service, the Mossad, in providing financial and tactical support for the very “Muslim extremists” presumed to be Israel’s worst enemies. The truth is that Muslim extremists have proven useful (if often unwitting) tools in advancing Israel’s own geopolitical agenda.

Although the media has devoted much coverage to the topic of “Islamic fundamentalism,” the media has failed to pursue the documented behind-the-scenes linkage between Israel and the terrorist networks now the focus of media obsession.

In fact, evidence suggests that the world’s number one Muslim villain—Osama bin Laden—was almost certainly working with the Mossad in years past.

Although many Americans are now aware that bin Laden’s early efforts against the Soviets in Afghanistan were sponsored by the CIA, the media has been reticent to point out that this arms pipeline—described by *Covert Action Information Bulletin* (September 1987) as “the second largest covert operation” in the CIA’s history—was also, according to former Mossad operative Victor Ostrovsky (writing in *The Other Side of Deception*), under the direct supervision of the Mossad.

Ostrovsky noted that: “It was a complex pipeline since a large portion of the Mujahideen’s weapons were American-made and were supplied to the Muslim Brotherhood directly from Israel, using as car-

riers the Bedouin nomads who roamed the demilitarized zones in the Sinai.”

Former ABC correspondent John K. Cooley, in *Unholy Wars: Afghanistan, America and International Terrorism*, provides some confirmation for Ostrovsky's allegations. He writes:

Discussion of the input of outsiders to training and operations in Afghanistan would be incomplete without mention of Iran and the State of Israel. Iran's major role in training and in supply is a matter of historical record. As for Israel, the evidence is much sketchier.

At least half a dozen knowledgeable individuals insisted to the author, without citing proof, that Israel was indeed involved in both training and supply ...

Whether or not units of Israel's elite Special Forces trained the Muslim warriors, who would soon turn their guns against Israel in Muslim organizations like Hamas, is a well-guarded Israeli secret.

Several Americans and Britons who took part in the training program have assured the author that Israelis did indeed take part, though no one will own to having actually seen, or spoken with, Israeli instructors or intelligence operatives in Afghanistan or Pakistan.

What is certain is that of all the members of the anti-Soviet coalition, the Israelis have been the most successful in concealing the details and even the broad traces of a training role; much more than the Americans and British ...

In addition, it should be noted that Sami Masri, a former insider in the infamous Bank of Credit and Commerce International (BCCI) told journalists Jonathan Beaty and S. C. Gwynne (both of *Time* magazine) that BCCI “was financing Israeli arms going into Afghanistan. There were Israeli arms, Israeli planes, and CIA pilots. Arms were coming into Afghanistan and [BCCI

was] facilitating.”

In fact, although BCCI was generally said to be an “Arab” or “Muslim” bank, BCCI was very much working in close concert with the Mossad in the very realm where bin Laden first made his mark.

So there is some evidence, indeed, that bin Laden was very much part of a network that was closely tied to Mossad intrigue in the arming and training of the Afghan rebels.

However, there’s much more to the story of the Mossad’s ties to the so-called Islamic terror networks that are the stuff of American nightmares today.

In his follow-up book, *The Other Side of Deception*, ex-Mossad figure Victor Ostrovsky unveils the disturbing fact that the Mossad had a secret history of supporting radical Islamic groups for its own purposes.

Pointing out that Arab- and Muslim-hating hard-liners in Israel and its Mossad believe that Israel’s survival lies in its military strength and that “this strength arises from the need to answer the constant threat of war,” the Israeli hard-liners fear that peace with any Arab state could weaken Israel and bring about its demise. In that vein, Ostrovsky writes:

Supporting the radical elements of Muslim fundamentalism sat well with the Mossad’s general plan for the region. An Arab world run by fundamentalists would not be a party to any negotiations with the West, thus leaving Israel again as the only democratic, rational country in the region.

One of Israel’s prime targets was the kingdom of Jordan, then-ruled by King Hussein, who was actually in the process of making peace overtures toward Israel. Ostrovsky reports that the Mossad was determined to “destabilize Jordan to the point of civil anarchy.” The means used were to be:

A high influx of counterfeit currency, causing distrust in the market; arming religious fundamen-

talist elements similar to the Hamas and the Muslim Brotherhood; and assassinating leading figures who are symbols of stability, causing riots in the universities and forcing the government to respond with harsh measures and lose popularity.

Actually, this tactic has also been used by the Mossad in dealing with non-Arab nations. For example, in the March 1982 edition of his newsletter, *Middle East Perspective*, Dr. Alfred Lilienthal, a pioneer American Jewish critic of Israeli excesses, reported that Italy's then-top-ranking magistrate, Ferdinando Imposimato, had charged, in Imposimato's words:

At least until 1978, the Israeli secret service infiltrated Italian subversive organizations and on more than one occasion gave arms, money and information to the [terrorist] Red Brigades. The Israeli plan was to reduce Italy to a country torn by civil war so that the United States would have to depend more on Israel for security in the Mediterranean.

Lilienthal pointed out that Imposimato's sources were two jailed Red Brigade leaders who reported that the Israelis had not only helped the Red Brigades enroll new recruits, but also track down traitors who fled abroad.

Even columnist Jack Anderson, a devoted news conduit for the Israeli lobby, has bragged of Israel's skill: He wrote as long ago as September 17, 1972 that:

The Israelis are also skillful at exploiting Arab rivalries and turning Arab against Arab. The Kurdish tribes, for example, inhabit the mountains of northern Iraq. Every month, a secret Israeli envoy slips into the mountains from the Iranian side to deliver \$50,000 to Kurdish leader Mulla Mustafa al Barzani. The subsidy insures Kurdish

hostility against Iraq, whose government is militantly anti-Israel.

In an April 25, 1983 column Anderson pointed out that one secret State Department report speculated that if Palestine Liberation Organization leader Yassir Arafat were to be dislodged, “the Palestinian movement will probably disintegrate into radical splinter groups, which, in combination with other revolutionary forces in the region, would pose a grave threat to the moderate Arab governments.”

Then, according to Anderson’s account, the State Department reported that:

Israel seems determined to vent this threat ... and can be expected to greatly expand its covert cooperation with revolutionary movements.

Anderson added that “two well-placed intelligence sources” had explained that this meant that it was in Israel’s interests to “divide and conquer” by setting various Palestinian factions against one another. This would then help destabilize all of the Arab and Islamic regimes in the Middle East. Anderson then stated flat-out that the sources said that “Israel had secretly provided funds to Abu Nidal’s group.”

Anderson’s reports about Abu Nidal’s apparent ties to the Mossad were only the tip of the iceberg. British journalist Patrick Seale, an acknowledged authority on the Middle East, devoted an entire book, entitled *Abu Nidal: A Gun for Hire*, outlining and documenting his thesis that Nidal was largely a surrogate for the Mossad all along.

Today Nidal (reportedly in retirement in Egypt) has been replaced by Osama bin Laden in media headlines as “the world’s most wanted terrorist.”

And, like Nidal’s efforts to divide the Arab world, particularly the Palestinian cause, bin Laden’s activities seem to have a congruence of interests with those of Israel; although this is some-

thing that the major media has not been ready to acknowledge.

While Bin Laden himself (quite notably) has never attacked an Israeli or Jewish target, even *The Washington Post* pointed out that bin Laden's primary goal is bolstering "a destabilizing brand of Islamic fundamentalism in a long list of existing Middle East and Central Asia regimes."

That same *Post* article revealed that—contrary to the general public view that somehow bin Laden is in league with favorite Israeli targets such as Iraq's Saddam Hussein and Libya's Muammar Qaddafi, a former bin Laden associate had testified that bin Laden was, in fact, quite hostile to both the Iraqi leader and the Libyan leader. This again is quite in line with Israel's attitude toward the two Arab icons.

So considering bin Laden's previous ties to the joint CIA-Mossad operations in Afghanistan coupled with his unusual congruence of agenda with the Mossad, the question arises as to whether bin Laden is a successor to presumed Mossad surrogate Abu Nidal in more ways than one.

And in light of recent questions about the real nationalities and identities of the purported "Arab hijackers" who brought down the four planes that created havoc on American soil on September 11, Jack Anderson's aforementioned September 17, 1972 column pointed out something that should be noted:

Israeli agents—immigrants whose families had lived in Arab lands for generations—have a perfect knowledge of Arab dialects and customs. They have been able to infiltrate Arab governments with ease.

Even Israeli sources have provided further data showing the extent to which the Mossad and other elements of Israeli intelligence have gone "under cover" in the Arab world. On September 29, 1998, famed Israeli journalist Yossi Melman, writing in Israel's newspaper, *Ha'aretz*, revealed that:

Shin Bet agents, who worked undercover in the Israeli-Arab sector in the 1950s, went as far as to marry Muslim women and have children with them, in an attempt to continue their mission without raising suspicion. When the unit was disbanded, some of the families were broken up, while in others, the women converted to Judaism and stayed with their husbands.

In fact, there are some doubts as to whether those who have been identified as the hijackers on September 11 were indeed the hijackers. Writing in *The New Yorker* on Oct. 8, 2001, veteran investigative journalist Seymour Hersh pointed out something that has otherwise gone un-mentioned in the mainstream media:

Many of the investigators believe that some of the initial clues about the terrorists' identities and preparations, such as flight manuals, were meant to be found. A former high-level intelligence official told me, "Whatever trail was left was left deliberately—for the FBI to chase."

Hersh has also raised questions about whether or not bin Laden's network was capable of carrying out the terrorist attack alone. Hersh noted that a senior military officer had suggested to him that, in Hersh's words, "a major foreign intelligence service might also have been involved."

Hersh did not point fingers anywhere, but a reader familiar with Hersh's past history of pinpointing intrigue by Israel's Mossad could perhaps read between the lines and guess at which foreign nation Hersh's source might, however obliquely, be alluding.

In the end, the idea of the CIA and the Mossad financing Islamic terrorist groups is not extraordinary to former readers of the now-defunct *Spotlight*.

As long ago as March 15, 1982, writing in *The Spotlight*, veteran correspondent Andrew St. George revealed that the big

secret about the scandal involving former top CIA official Edwin Wilson's international arms smuggling was Wilson's partnership with the Mossad. While Wilson contended that these activities were done with the approval of the CIA—which denied it, of course—the major media kept Wilson's Mossad link under wraps.

St. George reported that Wilson had teamed with two veteran Mossad agents, Hans Ziegler and David Langham, who set up a firm, Zimex, Ltd., based in Switzerland. The project was known by its CIA cryptonym, Klapex.

This venture was a joint undercover CIA-Mossad operation to set up a chain of dummy business firms for the purpose of selling and chartering personal jet aircraft to Arab leaders. The planes, ranging from Gulfstream II corporate jets to giant 707s, came with flight and maintenance crews, each of which had Mossad operatives among its members. The primary mission of the Israeli spies was to operate and service the elaborate electronic eavesdropping systems concealed in the cabin of each plane to record the confidential conversations of Arab statesmen in mid-flight.

However, St. George revealed, the commercial network under Klapex was used for an even more sinister purpose:

To provide covert aid to some nationalistic, pan-Arab and Islamic radical movements in Sudan, Egypt, Syria, Saudi Arabia and the other Persian Gulf states. In each case, when the Mossad extended such secret assistance—whether in cash or access to smuggled weapons, or in some other form—the purpose was to weaken or pressure some government thought hostile or dangerous to Israel at that particular moment.

What Israeli sponsorship, if any, can be found behind the current media-promoted Islamic bogeymen remains to be seen; but the evidence of past Israeli sponsorship and connections is there for those who dare to look for it.

CHAPTER SEVEN

Congressman Jerry Voorhis Was Right: The Federal Reserve Isn't “Federal”

On October 3, 1989 the influential *Washington Post*—America’s newspaper of political record—admitted that the mega-banks that make up the Federal Reserve System are privately owned. This was perhaps the first time this fact was acknowledged by an Establishment newspaper.

Invariably, when the Fed is discussed in any of the major media, the privately owned and operated Federal Reserve banks are characterized as “federal” entities.

However, they are not “federal.” The Federal Reserve banks are private entities. That the *Post* has acknowledged this is significant indeed.

The admission appeared in an article as part of the *Post*’s regular feature, “The Federal Page,” reporting on Congress and the bureaucracy.

The article did not focus on the ownership of the Federal Reserve banks. Instead, this reference to the private nature of the Fed was buried within the closing paragraphs of a report detailing a new pay hike for employees of the Federal Reserve System’s Board of Governors.

(The board is a seven-member, presidential-appointed body that governs the affairs of the Federal Reserve System, and thus of the nation’s economy. It is in this sense the only aspect of the Fed that is actually federal. In addition, the Federal Reserve System is composed of the heads of twelve privately-owned regional Federal Reserve banks, dominated by the influential Federal Reserve Bank of New York, which is largely under the control of the Rockefeller family and their corporate allies.)

The *Post* article noted that under the direction of Alan Greenspan, chairman of the board of governors, the Fed has set in place a new pay schedule “to meet competition from the private sector for key senior workers.”

Incredibly enough, Congress has no say whatsoever regarding in-house Fed pay hikes—this being part and parcel of the Fed’s vaunted “independent” status—and, it might be added, immunity—from independent, outside audits of its internal spending and the monetary policies it conducts.

The Fed, in fact, is authorized to set any pay schedule it wishes; that is, free to spend the taxpayers’ dollars at will. In the past, though, the Fed generally followed civil service pay schedules. However, as the *Post* noted in the intriguing paragraph in question (revealing the private nature of the Fed):

“The new pay schedule, which covers all 1,500 board employees, is not quite as high as those in effect in the private sector or at the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, which, like the 11 other regional Federal Reserve banks, technically is a private corporation free to set pay as it wishes, according to a board spokesman.”

It is appropriate that this revelation would appear in the pages of the *Post*. It was none other than the *Post*’s prime mover for many years, Wall Street money wizard Eugene Meyer, who was one of the early members of the Federal Reserve System’s board of governors. The *Post* today remains under the control of Meyer’s grandson, Donald, who holds the title “publisher.”

The Fed isn’t afraid to admit in the pages of a friendly newspaper like the *Post* that it’s really a private entity, since the *Post* is a reliable voice that functions as an ‘in-house’ journal for the Washington establishment. But now that we have confirmation from a so-called “reliable source”—a Fed spokesman being quoted in the prestigious *Post*—we can say with confidence that the

Federal Reserve banks aren't really federal at all. Critics of the Fed such as the late Rep. Jerry Voorhis (D-Calif.) were right all along.

And if Voorhis were in Congress today, there's no doubt that he would be leading the fight to audit—and abolish—the Federal Reserve System.

Defenders of the Fed call its critics “right wing nuts.” But there's no way they could tar Voorhis with that label. In fact, Voorhis—a former registered member of the Socialist Party—was one of the most “liberal” members of Congress by anyone's standards.

But Voorhis was an independent intellectual—a populist who was willing to buck the plutocratic elite—as he often did. As a consequence, it was taking on the Fed that turned the tide against Voorhis.

A self-described “Christian socialist”—and also a committed anti-communist—Voorhis was wise to the usurious reality of the privately owned and controlled banking monopoly known as the Federal Reserve.

In 1943 Voorhis went so far as to write a stirring indictment of the Fed, a controversial work entitled *Out of Debt, Out of Danger*. In his book Voorhis reviewed the history of the Fed and how it impacted upon American life to the detriment of this country's farmers, workers, and small businessmen. And it was precisely because of Voorhis' outspoken lambasting of the Fed that he paid the ultimate political price.

In 1946, as Voorhis sought a sixth term in the House of Representatives, a well-financed clique of financiers and industrialists (calling themselves the “Committee of One Hundred”) selected and bankrolled a candidate to oppose Voorhis for re-election.

In fact, an emissary of one of the major New York banking houses (which dominate the Fed through the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, the most influential of the Fed regional branches) came to southern California to meet with the mysterious com-

mittee, promising support for the campaign against Voorhis.

According to an agent of the banks, Voorhis was considered “one of the most dangerous men in Washington”—in the eyes of the plutocrats, that is.

Nonetheless, the well-established and popular Voorhis was confident of re-election. Voorhis, however, was taken by surprise, and because of a particularly malicious “dirty tricks” operation against him, he was defeated in one of the major political upsets of that year.

The mastermind of the Committee of One Hundred’s well-financed hit-and-run campaign against Voorhis was a notorious Los Angeles lawyer known throughout his shady career for his seemingly endless array of organized crime connections: the enigmatic Murray Chotiner.

In later years Chotiner worked closely with the Anti-Defamation League (ADL) of B’nai B’rith in organizing a similar Machiavellian black-bag operation against Liberty Lobby, the populist institution in Washington that published *The Spotlight*.

Perhaps not coincidentally, the ADL’s primary complaint against Liberty Lobby stemmed from the fact that Liberty Lobby had repeatedly asked the Justice Department to require that the ADL, a foreign agent for the state of Israel, register as such with the Justice Department as required under the Foreign Agents Registration Act—legislation authored by none other than Jerry Voorhis.

In any case, Congressman Voorhis had clearly made some powerful enemies within “the Establishment.” So did, in later years, the young Republican who had been drafted by the plutocrats to run against Voorhis and who, in fact, defeated the veteran populist. This young Republican was none other than Richard Milhouse Nixon.

Ironically, Nixon—prior to being “Watergated” from the presidency—said of Voorhis (whom he actually liked personally): “I suppose there was scarcely ever a man with higher ideals than

Jerry Voorhis, or better motivated than Jerry Voorhis.”

Yet, nearly thirty years later when the plutocratic-controlled media's wrath came crashing down on Nixon, the media energetically recalled Nixon's slash-and-burn campaign against Voorhis in 1946, carefully ignoring the fact that the powerful New York and international banking interests (which actually dominated the “mainstream media”) had been prime movers behind Nixon's assault on Voorhis.

After his reelection defeat, however, Voorhis nonetheless remained an outspoken critic of the Fed and later wrote: “The Fed does not act as a government instrumentality of the nation, nor are its policies and practices determined with the nation in mind. Instead of that, the banks and bankers run the Fed and run it for the benefit of the financial community in almost every respect.

“Money creation,” according to Voorhis, “is the greatest economic power known to man. That power ought always to be exercised in the interest of all the people, never for the sake of private gain of a privileged few.

“The banks—commercial banks and the Federal Reserve—create all the money of this nation, and the nation and its people pay interest on every dollar of that newly created money. This means that private banks exercise un-Constitutionally, immorally and ridiculously the power to tax the people. For every newly created dollar dilutes to some extent the value of every other dollar already in circulation.”

According to Voorhis: “A Federal Reserve System brought under control by the elected officials of the United States could be run in the public interest instead of in that of the money-lending community as is now the case.”

CHAPTER EIGHT

The Oklahoma City Bombing

(Previously Unpublished)

Most Americans have no idea that the May 22, 2001 issue of *The Village Voice* featured a well-written and succinct overview of the holes in the FBI propaganda line regarding the official government story about events surrounding the Oklahoma City bombing.

Entitled *Beyond McVeigh: What the Feds Won't Tell You About Oklahoma City*, the article by well-known veteran liberal journalist James Ridgeway says that, quite simply, the official government version of events, “doesn’t make sense.”

Ridgeway comments that, “As wacky as their claims may at first seem, conspiracy theorists say the question of whether the government knew about the plot beforehand—or even played some role in it—cannot be ignored.” He then proceeds to provide his readers what he calls “a list of certain—but by no means all—of the events that hint at a broader plot.”

Suffice it to say that virtually all of the points referenced by Ridgeway are familiar to *American Free Press* readers, but they probably proved quite eye-opening for Ridgeway’s liberal “constituency” among the readers of *The Village Voice*.

Ridgeway wraps up with the story of Andreas Strassmeir, who was almost certainly a federal undercover informant alongside Timothy McVeigh, and whom the now-defunct *Spotlight* said all along was probably the central figure to unraveling what really happened. Notably, Ridgeway closes with the pointed story that once, when an Oklahoma witness talked with a German-accented individual believed to be Strassmeir and asked him (evidently quite perceptively) if he worked for the government, the person believed to be Strassmeir “kinda laughed.”

Stephen Jones, former attorney for McVeigh, has stated flat out

in the new, updated edition of his book, *Others Unknown*, that he wants it to be made clear that he knew from the beginning that there was indeed a “John Doe #2.” Jones describes his source for this information as “impeccable”—no less than McVeigh himself.

In an appearance on the June 11 broadcast of the CBS program *48 Hours*, Jones revealed that McVeigh showed “deception” on his initial lie detector test when asked specific questions about the involvement of others in the bombing, in particular as to whether others accompanied him in the delivery of the bomb to the Murrah building.

What is so amazing is that advocates of the FBI’s “lone bomber” theory are now trying to discredit Jones—who was the court-appointed defense attorney in the largest mass-murder trial in American history—as a “publicity seeker” for daring to raise questions about his former client’s credibility.

In fact, according to independent investigator J.D. Cash, McVeigh’s lawyers actually came to believe that McVeigh was delusional and wondered if McVeigh might actually believe he was the reincarnation of Revolutionary War hero Patrick Henry.

Cash notes that, “During his first weeks in jail, McVeigh exhibited all the symptoms of a ‘crankster’ coming down from the destructive effects of [LSD and crystal-meth],” two drugs which McVeigh’s sister has confirmed that McVeigh experimented with.

McVeigh’s “hot buttons,” according to Cash, were “fringe right-wing ideology and fantasies involving women.”

In this regard, it is interesting that Kirk Lyons, the close friend and counsel for reputed McVeigh associate Andreas Strassmeir, was an active recruiter for the Elohim City compound in Arkansas, near the Oklahoma border, promising young “white nationalists” that they could find the women of their dreams at Elohim City.

Van Loman, a veteran figure in the nationalist movement, told *The Spotlight* that after his own marriage failed, Lyons enthusiastically promoted the idea that Loman relocate to Elohim City

to find a boon companion.

Confidant he could find a new love without taking up residence in Lyons' right wing "lonely hearts club," Loman now says: "I can only wonder what course my life would have taken if I had followed Kirk Lyons' suggestion and taken up residence at Elohim City. God knows. I might have been consorting with the likes of Andreas Strassmeir and Timothy McVeigh and somehow inadvertently been drawn into their web of intrigue."

The question is whether Tim McVeigh acted on a recommendation similar to what Loman rejected.

The major media—along with the ADL and Morris Dees of the Southern Poverty Law Center—continue to suggest that those who doubt the government's official story about the Oklahoma bombing are trying to make Timothy McVeigh a "martyr." Nothing could be further from the truth.

The fact is that most who doubt the official government line on the bombing also believe McVeigh lied when he gave his "inside" account to the two authors who produced the new volume in which McVeigh purportedly tells "the whole story."

All evidence accumulated—both by the government and by independent investigators who question the official government line—suggests that McVeigh was involved in the bombing.

Where the government and the independent investigators part company is on the question as to whether there were others involved.

CHAPTER NINE

Populist Author Speaks in Malaysia

Michael Collins Piper spent some ten days in the Southeast Asian republic of Malaysia in August of 2004. Hosted by a variety of independent organizations and private individuals, Piper visited Kuala Lumpur, the super-modern capital of the rising Asian economic powerhouse, to launch the publication of his controversial books, *Final Judgment: The Missing Link in the JFK Assassination Conspiracy*, and *The High Priests of War*, the first-ever in-depth look at the history of the pro-Israel neo-conservatives who control U.S. foreign policy under President George W. Bush.

Although Malaysia is a multi-ethnic country with large Chinese and Indian minorities, with the native Malay population predominating, English is widely and fluently spoken throughout the country, which had been part of the British Empire.

Several thousand copies of both of Piper's books are already in circulation in Malaysia, and it is available in major bookstores in that country—the same thing cannot be said for the United States. (Since Piper's initial visit, *The High Priests of War* has also been published in Malay, and his latest book, *The New Jerusalem*, has also been published in English in Malaysia.)

Piper's visit was quite auspicious, since, as his hosts pointed out, this was the first time an American known as an outspoken populist, nationalist, and critic of the Israeli lobby in Washington visited Malaysia in such a high-profile way.

As chair of the Non-Aligned Movement and the Organization of Islamic Countries, Malaysia is increasingly influential on the world stage, particularly after twenty years of rule by popular former Prime Minister Dr. Mahathir Mohamad, who defied efforts by globalists to

impose dictatorial rules upon his nation through such engines of imperial power as the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank.

The first event of Piper's tour was a lecture at the five-star Mutiara Hotel in Kuala Lumpur with an overflow crowd of nearly 300 in attendance—a remarkable array of prominent attorneys, businessmen, industrialists, academics, and diplomats including a representative of the U.S. Embassy in Malaysia.

Dr. Chandra Muzaffar, an attorney and prolific writer and lecturer regarded as one of Asia's premier intellectuals, was moderator. The president of the International Movement for a Just World (JUST), Muzaffar is widely respected internationally.

Later, JUST itself featured a special appearance by Piper, addressing an equally large and interested assembly on "The Hidden Power Behind Washington" not only featuring the obvious issue of Israeli lobby influence, but also such power blocs as the Council on Foreign Relations, the Trilateral Commission, and the more secretive Bilderberg group which—Piper discovered—was hardly known at all to his otherwise well-informed audience. Dr. R. S. McCoy, the Malaysian division chair of the International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War, was moderator.

During a visit to the historic island of Penang—known as "the Pearl of the Orient"—Piper addressed this question: "The U.S. in the Middle East: Is Peace Possible?" to a gathering of academics and graduate students at the Center for International Studies at the School of Social Sciences at the University Sains [Science] Malaysia. The moderator, Professor Johan S. Abdullah, concluded by presenting Piper with a book by Cecil Regendra, the prominent attorney, poet and human rights activist who attended Piper's lecture.

Initially, there were plans for Piper to speak in a classroom course conducted by Dr. A. B. Kopanski at the distinguished International Islamic University (IIU) in Kuala Lumpur. Like Piper, Kopanski is a member of the board of advisors of *The Barnes*

Review, the revisionist historical journal; and last year he came to Washington to speak at the joint TBR-AFP conference on real history and the First Amendment.

However, Piper's visit to Malaysia generated so much interest in intellectual circles that university officials independently arranged for a larger venue at their institution which has students from some 100 countries.

As a consequence, a standing-room only crowd (some 300 strong) of energetic students greeted Piper. IIU President Seri Sanusi Junid, a highly respected figure in Malaysian affairs, joined Piper on stage for the lecture and honored the American by conferring upon him the title of "protected one," to the delight of the students who enjoyed Piper's lecture on "The Neo-Conservatives, Zionism and Palestine."

Piper addressed the equally controversial topic, "Is the American Press Really Free?" at the national headquarters of the Malaysian Bar Council, the attorneys' association which, in Malaysia (in contrast to the United States), is highly independent and outspoken, often standing as a counter-point to the government. Piper noted that although in countries such as Malaysia, where the government often partially controls (or places restrictions on) the media, in the United States the situation is different: private corporations and special interest groups own the media and use that power to control the political process.

What is interesting is that there was a concerted behind-the-scenes effort to block Piper from addressing the Bar Council. An anonymous caller—believed to be from the Anti-Defamation League (ADL), the Israeli lobby pressure group in the United States—urged the Council to cancel Piper's engagement, referring to "evidence" against Piper on the ADL website "proving" Piper was dangerous. Bar leaders rejected the ADL's advice and the moderator of the event, well-known attorney Tommy Thomas, pointed out that in the long history of the council's forums there had never once been an effort to prevent a speaker from being

heard, despite a long record of controversial speakers representing wide-ranging points of view.

The closing event in Piper's lecture tour was sponsored by *Oriental News*, the Chinese language newspaper in Kuala Lumpur. Before a friendly and fascinated crowd of roughly 250 people, Piper addressed the topic: "The U.S. Map for Global Dominance in the 21st Century," pointing out that although the neo-conservatives in the ruling elite in Washington are known for their parochial enthusiasm for Israel, what is little known is that they place Israel's interests and security first and foremost, even in the conduct of U.S. policy toward Asia, Europe, Africa and South Africa, believing that all such policies must be focused on what is best for Israel.

What follows is Piper's personal account of his historic trip to Malaysia:

My trip to Kuala Lumpur, the capital of Malaysia, along with side-journeys to other destinations in that remarkable country, gave me a unique chance to learn quite a bit about a land that remains mysterious to most Americans, despite the fact that Malaysia is one of the economic powerhouses of Southeast Asia and is, beyond any question, a leader of the Third World and other non-aligned countries. More importantly, however, it gave me the chance to hear what the people of Malaysia are thinking about the United States and its globalist policies today—points of view that reflect worldwide opinion in many ways.

During my visit I not only met with average working people, but also an array of attorneys, scholars, intellectuals, political dissidents, business leaders, journalists, and several former government officials. It is safe to say that—despite their socio-economic and ethnic and religious differences—all were consistent in saying one thing:

"Contrary to what George W. Bush claims, we don't hate

America or the American people, but we definitely do not like the policies being carried out by the U.S. president and his neo-conservative advisors.”

It's as simple as that. In fact, the Malaysian point of view reflects the thinking of people in Russia and in Abu Dhabi in the United Arab Emirates, two other places where I've spoken during the past several years.

Although Malaysia holds up Islam as its state religion, the country is religiously and ethnically diverse with large populations of Chinese, Indians, and others; and is quite modern and forward looking, with English widely spoken among all groups of people, including the majority Malay population.

Malaysians relish their culture and history and are determined to remain independent, suspicious of many aspects of what is roughly known as “American” culture, but which—as any thinking American knows full well—is actually a brand of “culture” promulgated by the controlled media in the United States and which, if truth be told, often hardly reflects American tradition itself.

While Malaysians enjoy American fashion, motion pictures—all manner of “our American way of life”—they are intent on retaining their own individuality. There will be no “One World” for the people of Malaysia, even if America's rulers remain dedicated to the dream of a Global Plantation. That is why the outspoken nationalism of their long-time prime minister, the highly-acclaimed Dr. Mahathir Mohammed, and their current leader, Abdullah Ahmad Badawi, is very much appreciated by these independent-minded people.

In Malaysia it is commonly known that the Israeli lobby is a major player in shaping U.S. foreign policy. And many Americans will be pleased to learn that Malaysian intellectuals are also very much aware of the intrigues of such power blocs as the Council on Foreign Relations and the Trilateral Commission, although the existence of the more secretive Bilderberg group came as a surprise to many Malaysians.

The Malaysians with whom I spoke—and who represent, as I've noted, a diverse array of ethnic groups and religions—are uniformly concerned that the current rulers of the United States (as opposed to the American people as a whole) are bent on world empire. They perceive the United States economy as the vehicle of international bankers, and are aware of the manipulations of the Federal Reserve System on the American monetary system, interlinked with the financial empire of the Rothschild family of Europe. In this vein, Malaysians see American fighting men and women as pawns, the cannon fodder of these high-level forces whose aims they reject.

Although the Islamic faith is strong in Malaysia, many Malaysians—and this will surprise many Americans—are quite suspicious of hard-line Islamic fundamentalism, and even question whether Osama bin Laden is “for real.”

That is—to put it bluntly—many Malaysians (as do many people in the Islamic Middle East, for example) suspect that bin Laden is actually a creature of Israel's intelligence service, the Mossad, and its allies in various elements of the U.S. national security apparatus, and that bin Laden has been a useful tool in a covert campaign to establish a world hegemon under the domination of the Zionist elements and its collaborators in the international super-capitalist community.

In my various presentations in Malaysia, I emphasized the role of the media monopoly in the United States in shaping American policy, pointing out that while in many countries the government controls the media, in the United States, the owners of the media—a small, tightly-knit group of families and financial interests—exercise their power to control the government, and thereby the politicians, and the agenda they carry out. The Malaysian people had no trouble in understanding this concept, although many Americans have yet to recognize this reality.

Uniformly, my Malaysian audiences asked: “What will it take to break this media power and the consequences it entails?”

My answer was this: “Although Americans as a whole remain largely ignorant of what is happening, they are, in increasing numbers, thanks to independent voices such as *American Free Press*, opening their eyes. In the meantime, there are growing numbers of good, patriotic Americans inside the State Department, the military, the CIA and other intelligence agencies, and elsewhere, who are becoming increasingly dissatisfied with ‘politics as usual’ and beginning to speak out, questioning the global intentions of the Zionist lobby.

“Ultimately”, I concluded, “these opinion-makers will begin to make their voices heard more and more. And that’s why not only the American people—but people around the world—need to support not only independent media voices, but those in positions of power in the United States and elsewhere who are prepared to speak out, the consequences be damned.”

In that regard, it’s probably no coincidence that just as I was about to depart Malaysia, word came that there had been a long-standing FBI inquiry into the activities of the Israeli lobby and its ties with neo-conservative trouble-makers inside the Bush administration. It was almost as if this was positive confirmation that there are those who do dare to speak out.

The final outcome of this investigation—and subsequent events—remains to be seen, but America’s real patriots can rest assured that they have the friendship of real patriots in Malaysia, and everywhere else around the globe; the media monopoly’s claim that “the rest of the world hates us” notwithstanding.





SECTION TWO

Assassinations

CHAPTER TEN

Israel's Nuclear Ambitions Linked to JFK Assassination

Did John F. Kennedy's determined (and then secret) behind-the-scenes efforts to prevent Israel from building a nuclear weapons arsenal play a pivotal part in the events that led to his assassination on November 22, 1963?

Was Israel's intelligence service, the Mossad, a front-line player in the JFK assassination conspiracy alongside elements of the CIA and international organized crime?

Why did Hollywood film-maker Oliver Stone fail to reveal—in his 1993 all-star JFK assassination extravaganza—that the hero of his epic, former New Orleans District Attorney Jim Garrison, had privately concluded that the Mossad was ultimately the driving force behind JFK's murder?

As the 40th anniversary of the JFK assassination approaches—with worldwide attention focused on the problems of nuclear proliferation in the Middle East—is it valid or appropriate to raise the question of possible Israeli complicity in the assassination of an American president?

These are just a few of the hotly controversial questions being posed by Michael Collins Piper in his book, *Final Judgment*, which has emerged as a proverbial “underground best-seller” in the United States, the topic of heated debate on the Internet, and the subject of angry exchanges in a variety of public forums.

What follows is Piper's own comprehensive survey of his findings as published in *Final Judgment*.

In 1992, former U.S. Congressman Paul Findley, a liberal Republican, made the little-noticed but intriguing comment that “in

all the words written about the assassination of John F. Kennedy, Israel's intelligence agency, the Mossad, has never been mentioned, despite the obvious fact Mossad complicity is as plausible as any of the other theories.”

Where in the world could Findley—never known to be an extremist by any means, and certainly not one given to venting conspiracy theories—have ever come up with such an assertion?

Actually, it's not so extraordinary a thesis if one looks at the historical record, placing all of the conventional theories about the JFK assassination in a new perspective, calculating in previously little-known details that shed stark light on the circumstances surrounding JFK's demise and the geopolitical crises in which the American president was embroiled at the time of his shocking murder.

In truth, even the most recently widely-disseminated exposition of JFK assassination theorizing—Oliver Stone's 1993 blockbuster film, *JFK*—did not present the entire picture.

Although Stone portrayed former New Orleans District Attorney Jim Garrison as a hero for pointing the finger in the direction of elements of the U.S. military and intelligence networks as the guiding force behind JFK's murder, what Stone didn't tell his audience was something even more controversial: that privately, after some years of research and reflection, Garrison had reached an even more startling determination: that the driving force behind JFK's murder was no less than Israel's feared intelligence service, the Mossad.

As astounding as it sounds, there's actually good reason to conclude that Garrison may have been looking in the right direction. And in this day when the debate over “weapons of mass destruction” is in the forefront of global discussion, it is not so extraordinary a thesis as it seems.

The 40th anniversary of the assassination of John F. Kennedy approaches; and the fascination with the murder of America's 35th president won't go away. Assassination “buffs”—not just in

the United States, but around the globe—continue to chip away at the conclusions of the two official U.S. government investigations into the affair.

Although the 1976 report by a special committee of the U.S. Congress formally contradicted the earlier 1964 finding by the presidentially-appointed Warren Commission that alleged assassin Lee Harvey Oswald was acting alone, and concluded instead that there was indeed the likelihood of a conspiracy behind the president's murder—hinting broadly at the involvement of organized crime—the congressional committee's final determination actually raised more questions, in some respects, than it answered.

In 1993, Hollywood's Oliver Stone entered the fray with his blockbuster all-star extravaganza, *JFK*, which presented Stone's interpretation of the widely-publicized 1967-1969 JFK assassination inquiry by then-New Orleans District Attorney Jim Garrison.

Stone's film—featuring Kevin Costner as Garrison—raised the specter of involvement by elements of the so-called “military-industrial complex,” along with a scattering of anti-Castro Cuban exiles, right-wing militants, and rogue Central Intelligence Agency operatives. The film told the story of Garrison's investigation, and ultimately unsuccessful prosecution, of New Orleans businessman Clay Shaw (then suspected of being—and later proven to be—a collaborator with the CIA) for involvement in the JFK conspiracy.

However, as we now know, not even Stone was faithful to his hero. Long-time independent JFK assassination investigator A. J. Weberman has since revealed that during the 1970s—well after Garrison's prosecution of Shaw—that Garrison was circulating the manuscript for a novel (never published) in which Garrison named Israel's Mossad as the mastermind of the JFK assassination conspiracy.

Garrison never said anything about this unusual thesis—at least publicly. But beginning in the mid-1980s, and well into the

present day, new evidence has emerged that not only points to good reason for Mossad motivation to move against John F. Kennedy, but also to the likelihood that not only Clay Shaw (Garrison's target) but other key figures often associated in published writings with the JFK assassination were indeed closely tied to the Mossad and doing its bidding.

And what is particularly interesting is that none of the individuals in question—Shaw included—happened to be Jewish. So the allegation of Mossad involvement being somehow “anti-Semitic” in nature falls flat on that fact alone. But Mossad complicity—as the record indicates—is a very real possibility.

Garrison's critics continue to assert that the New Orleans District Attorney couldn't make up his mind as to whom he thought had orchestrated the assassination of President John F. Kennedy. This indeed was the primary complaint against the ram-bunctious, outspoken, and quite colorful prosecutor: that he simply couldn't make up his mind. And this is one of the reasons that even many of Garrison's supporters not only began to question his sincerity, but even as to whether Garrison's investigation was worth the trouble.

In truth, Garrison did tend to shoot from the hip. That may have been his biggest mistake—one of many—in the course of his controversial inquiry into the murder of America's 35th president.

At one time or another during the course of that investigation, Garrison pointed his finger at one or another of the various possible conspirators—ranging from “right-wing extremists” to “Texas oil barons” to “anti-Castro Cuban exiles” to “rogue CIA operatives.” Occasionally, Garrison went so far as to say that the conspiracy included a combination of those possible conspirators.

When Garrison finally brought one man to trial, widely respected New Orleans trade executive Clay Shaw, Garrison had narrowed his field, suggesting, primarily, that Shaw had been one of the lower-level players in the conspiracy.

According to Garrison, Shaw was essentially doing the bidding of highly-placed figures in what has roughly been described as “the military-industrial complex” — that combination of financial interests and armaments manufacturers whose power and influence in official Washington—and around the world—is a very real force in global affairs.

Garrison suggested that Shaw and his co-conspirators had multiple motivations stimulating their decision to move against President Kennedy. Among other things, he asserted:

- The conspirators opposed JFK’s decision to begin withdrawing U.S. forces from Indochina;
- They were angry at his failure to provide military cover support for Cuban exiles attempting to topple Fidel Castro in the botched Bay of Pigs invasion;
- They were bitter at JFK for firing long-time CIA Director Allen Dulles, a grand old man of the Cold War against the Soviet Union; and
- In addition, Garrison hinted, JFK’s successor, Lyndon Johnson, may have wanted JFK removed from office for the purpose of claiming the crown for himself, but also because JFK and his younger brother, Attorney General Robert Kennedy, were not only plotting to remove Johnson from the Democratic national ticket in 1964, as well as conducting federal criminal investigations of many of Johnson’s closest associates and financial backers—even including those in the realm of organized crime.

In the end, after a relatively brief deliberation, the jury hearing the Shaw case acquitted Shaw. It was only later—much later—that evidence emerged that Shaw had indeed been a CIA informant, despite Shaw’s protestations to the contrary.

Only in recent years has it been determined, for example, that the American CIA was deliberately sabotaging Garrison’s investigation from within, not to mention providing assistance to Shaw’s defense. And although there are those who continue to say that Shaw’s acquittal “proved” that Shaw had nothing whatsoever

to do with the JFK conspiracy, the bigger picture suggests quite the contrary.

Shaw was involved with something very murky, and so were others in Shaw's circle of friends and associates. And they were, in turn, directly connected to the strange activities of Lee Harvey Oswald in New Orleans the summer just prior to the assassination of John F. Kennedy, before Oswald's sojourn to Dallas. Dozens of writers—many with differing points of view—have documented all of this, time and again.

So although the “official” legend is that Jim Garrison believed that the CIA and the military-industrial complex were the prime movers behind JFK's murder, when all was said and done, Jim Garrison had privately reached quite a different conclusion, one that remains largely unknown even to many people who worked with Garrison throughout the course of his investigation.

In fact, as noted, Garrison had decided—based on the entirety of everything that he had learned from a wide variety of sources—that the most likely masterminds of the JFK assassination were operatives of Israel's intelligence service, the Mossad.

The remarkable truth is that—although Garrison apparently didn't know it at the time, precisely because the facts had yet to be revealed—Garrison may have been on to something far more than he realized.

The public record now demonstrates that in 1963 JFK was embroiled in a bitter secret conflict with Israeli leader David Ben-Gurion over Israel's drive to build the atomic bomb; that Ben-Gurion resigned in disgust, saying that because of JFK's policies, Israel's “existence [was] in danger.” Then upon JFK's assassination, U.S. policy toward Israel began an immediate 180-degree turnaround.

Israeli historian Avner Cohen's new book, *Israel and the Bomb*, confirms the conflict between JFK and Israel so powerfully that Israel's *Ha'aretz* declared Cohen's revelations would “necessitate the rewriting of Israel's entire history.” From Israel's

perspective, writes Cohen, “Kennedy’s demands [on Israel] seemed diplomatically inappropriate ... inconsistent with national sovereignty.” In any case, Cohen pointed out, “The transition from Kennedy to [Lyndon] Johnson ... benefited the Israeli nuclear program.”

Ethan Bronner, in the *New York Times*, called Israel’s drive to build a nuclear bomb “a fiercely hidden subject.” This explains why JFK researchers—and Jim Garrison—never considered an Israeli angle.

While all of this presents a strong motive for Israel to strike against JFK, even maverick Israeli journalist Barry Chamish acknowledges that there exists “a pretty cogent case” for Mossad collaboration with the CIA in the assassination conspiracy.

The fact is that when Jim Garrison prosecuted Clay Shaw with conspiracy in the assassination, Garrison had stumbled upon the Mossad link.

Although (after his acquittal) Shaw was revealed to have been a CIA asset, in 1963 Shaw also served on the board of a Rome-based company, Permindex, which was (the evidence suggests) actually a front for a Mossad-sponsored arms procurement operation.

How and why Shaw happened to end up in association with this operation remains a mystery, but the very clear role of the Mossad in the activities of Permindex is beyond question, protestations notwithstanding.

Judge for yourself: A primary shareholder in Permindex, the Banque De Credit Internationale of Geneva, was not only the fiefdom of Tibor Rosenbaum, a high-level and long-time Mossad official—indeed, one of the founding fathers of Israel—but also the chief money launderer for Meyer Lansky, “chairman” of the crime syndicate and long-time Israeli loyalist.

According to Meyer Lansky’s sympathetic Israeli biographers: “After Israel became a state, almost 90 percent of its purchases of arms abroad were channeled through Rosenbaum’s

bank. The financing of many of Israel's most daring secret operations was carried out through the funds in [BCI]." BCI also served as a depository for the Permindex account.

That Tibor Rosenbaum's BCI was a controlling force behind the enigmatic Permindex entity places Israel and its Mossad in the very center of the conspiracy behind the assassination of John F. Kennedy.

Note also that the chief executive and shareholder of Permindex was Louis Bloomfield of Montreal, a top figure in the Israeli lobby in Canada (and internationally) and a long-time operative of the family of World Jewish Congress chief Samuel Bronfman—an intimate Lansky business partner in the international traffic of bootleg whiskey during Prohibition and, much later, a leading patron of Israel.

Permindex was clearly the Israeli link to the JFK assassination. The Permindex link also explains the "French connection" featured in the documentary *The Men Who Killed Kennedy*, but which failed to tell the entire story:

- That Permindex was also involved in assassination attempts against French President Charles DeGaulle by the French "Secret Army Organization" (OAS) which itself had close ties to the Mossad.

- Like the OAS, the Israelis hated DeGaulle not only because he gave independence to Algeria, a major new Arab state, but also because DeGaulle, who had assisted Israel, had withdrawn support, objecting (as did JFK) to Israel's drive for an atomic arsenal.

- A French intelligence officer alleged to this author in 1993 that the Mossad contracted out at least one of JFK's assassins—probably a Corsican hit man—through a French intelligence official disloyal to DeGaulle who hated JFK for supporting Algerian independence.

There is also firm evidence—based on revelations by the late respected journalist Stewart Alsop—that JFK was also planning a strike against Red China's nuclear bomb program—a plan scut-

ted by Lyndon Johnson within a month of JFK's assassination.

During this same period, according to famed British intelligence historian Donald McCormack (writing under the nom de plume Richard Deacon in his book *The Israeli Secret Service*), Israel and Red China were involved in joint secret nuclear bomb research.

We now know, in addition, that a key player in the Permindex web, Shaul Eisenberg, emerged as the Mossad's liaison with China, and ultimately played a key role in developing the massive global weapons transfers between Israel and China that came to public attention in the 1980s.

It is also not incidental that James Angleton, the CIA liaison to the Mossad, was a devoted partisan of Israel who not only orchestrated the scenario linking accused assassin Lee Harvey Oswald to the Soviet KGB, but who also later circulated disinformation to confuse investigations into the assassination. The tales of Angleton's intrigues with the Mossad during the Cold War are legion.

As far as the oft-discussed "Mafia" connection to the JFK assassination, even "mainstream" sources on organized crime note that the Italian-American "Mafia" figures most often accused of being behind the assassination—Carlos Marcello of New Orleans and Santo Trafficante of Tampa, Florida—were actually subordinates of Mossad-associated Meyer Lansky.

In addition, the nephew and namesake of the infamous Chicago Mafia boss, Sam Giancana—also often fingered as a possible sponsor of the JFK assassination—has recently put forth the assertion that the real boss of the Chicago Mafia was an American Jewish associate of Meyer Lansky—one Hyman "Hal" Lerner—who, while pulling the strings of Giancana and the Chicago Mafia, was also actively collaborating in international intrigue with Israel's Mossad.

It is no wonder that some critics suggest that perhaps Oliver Stone failed to mention these details in *JFK* because the film was

financed by Arnon Milchan, an Israeli arms dealer-turned-Hollywood producer whom even CBS's *Sixty Minutes* has linked to smuggling of material to Israel's nuclear program—which, of course, just happened to be the bitter (and perhaps fatal) point of contention between JFK and Israel.

Although Israeli diplomat Uri Palti has declared all of this—as outlined in detail in this author's book, *Final Judgment*—to be “nonsense,” and CIA-connected author Gerald Posner branded it “outlandish,” while pro-Israel neo-conservative columnist George Will declared it “vicious intellectual licentiousness,” *The Los Angeles Times* grudgingly admitted in 1997 that the thesis of *Final Judgment* was “novel indeed,” saying it “weave[s] together some of the key threads in a tapestry that many say is unique.”

And it should be noted that although there are many who believe that the CIA had a hand in the JFK assassination, quite a few of those same people are fearful of mentioning the likelihood of a Mossad role. Yet, as journalist Andrew Cockburn has pointed out:

There has been since almost the earliest days of the Israeli state and the earliest days of the CIA a secret bond, basically by which Israeli intelligence did jobs for the CIA and for the rest of American intelligence. You can't understand what's been going on with American covert operations and the Israeli covert operations until you understand this secret arrangement.

There are at least three major books by well-known journalists who document the subterranean links between the CIA and the Mossad, not to mention, in one facet or another, aspects of JFK's bitter secret conflict with Israel, not only over nuclear arms policy, but over U.S. Middle East policy in general. In addition, these volumes demonstrate that U.S. policy did indeed do a drastic turn-about upon the death of President Kennedy:

- 1) *The Samson Option: Israel's Nuclear Arsenal and*

American Foreign Policy by Pulitzer Prize-winning veteran *New York Times* journalist Seymour Hersh.

2) *Dangerous Liaison: The Inside Story of the U.S.-Israeli Covert Relationship* by husband-and-wife team, Andrew and Leslie Cockburn, both respected liberal journalists; and

3) *Taking Sides: America's Secret Relations with a Militant Israel* by Stephen Green, who has been associated with the very “mainstream” Council on Foreign Relations and the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.

Hersh and Green, by the way, are Jewish. All three books were published by respected publishing houses.

All of these volumes make it very clear that JFK and Israeli Prime Minister David Ben-Gurion were at serious loggerheads, to the point that Ben-Gurion believed that JFK's policy was a threat to Israel's very survival—and said so. Upon JFK's assassination, American policy toward the Middle East did an amazing 180 degree turn-about—the most immediate result of the American president's murder. This is a cold, hard, indisputable fact not subject to debate. The evidence is all too clear.

Hersh has noted that the Israeli press and the world press “told the world that Ben-Gurion's sudden resignation was a result of his dissatisfaction with domestic political scandals and turmoil that were rocking Israel.” However, Hersh went on to say, quite significantly, that there was “no way for the Israeli public” to know that there was “yet another factor” behind the resignation: specifically, in Hersh's words, Ben-Gurion's “increasingly bitter impasse with Kennedy over a nuclear-armed Israel.” The final showdown with JFK over the nuclear bomb was clearly the “primary reason” behind Ben-Gurion's resignation.

The drive to build a nuclear bomb was not only a major aim of Israel's defense policy (its very foundation); it was also a particularly special interest of Ben-Gurion.

In any event, Seymour Hersh's revelations about JFK and Ben-Gurion have been eclipsed by a more recent volume on the same

subject—one by an Israeli scholar, Avner Cohen. When Cohen released his 1999 book *Israel and the Bomb* (New York: Columbia University Press), the book created quite a sensation in Israel.

The “nuclear option” was not only at the very core of Ben-Gurion’s *personal* worldview, but the very foundation of Israel’s national security policy. The Israelis were essentially willing, if necessary, to “blow up the world”—including themselves—if they had to do so in order to defeat their Arab foes.

This is what Hersh said Israeli nuclear planners considered “the Samson Option”—that, as Samson of the Bible, after being captured by the Philistines, brought down Dagon’s Temple in Gaza and killed himself along with his enemies. As Hersh put it, “For Israel’s nuclear advocates, the Samson Option became another way of saying ‘Never again’ (in reference to preventing another Holocaust).”

All of the evidence, taken together in the big picture, clearly demonstrates that it was indeed “The Samson Option” that was the primary cause of Ben-Gurion’s resignation.

The bottom line is that—in 1963—JFK’s conflict with Ben-Gurion was a secret to both the Israeli public and the American public, and remained so for more than twenty years at least; and still remains so, despite the release of Hersh’s book, followed by *Final Judgment*, and then the book by Avner Cohen.

Avner Cohen’s very powerful book essentially confirmed everything that Hersh had written, but went even further.

Cohen describes how the conflict between JFK and Ben-Gurion was reaching its pinnacle in 1963 and how, on June 16 of that year, JFK sent a letter to the Israeli leader that Cohen says was “the toughest and most explicit message” yet. Cohen adds:

Kennedy exerted the most useful leverage available to an American president in dealing with Israel: a threat that an unsatisfactory solution would jeopardize the U.S. government’s commitment to, and support of, Israel ...

Ben-Gurion never read the letter. Instead, he announced his resignation. Cohen says that Ben-Gurion never provided an explanation for his decision, except in reference to “personal reasons.” To his cabinet colleagues Ben-Gurion said that he “must” resign and that “no state problem or event caused it.” Cohen adds that Ben-Gurion had “concluded that he could not tell the truth about Dimona to American leaders, not even in private.”

Immediately upon Ben-Gurion’s resignation, JFK wrote a letter to the new Prime Minister Levi Eshkol that was evidently *even fiercer* than JFK’s previous communications with Ben-Gurion. Avner Cohen writes:

Not since Eisenhower’s message to Ben-Gurion in the midst of the Suez crisis in November 1956 had an American president been so blunt with an Israeli prime minister.

Kennedy told Eshkol that the U.S. commitment and support of Israel “could be seriously jeopardized” if Israel did not let the United States obtain “reliable information” about its efforts in the nuclear field.

Kennedy’s demands were unprecedented. They amounted, in effect, to an ultimatum.

Cohen notes that: “From [Eshkol’s] perspective, Kennedy’s demands seemed diplomatically inappropriate; they were inconsistent with national sovereignty. There was no legal basis or political precedent for such demands,” Cohen says. “Kennedy’s letter precipitated a near-crisis situation in the prime minister’s office.” Kennedy’s pressure on Israel did *not* end with the resignation of Ben-Gurion. *Instead*, it clearly intensified.

The Israeli newspaper, *Ha’aretz*, published a review of Cohen’s book on February 5, 1999, calling it “a bombshell of a book.” The *Ha’aretz* review, by Reuven Pedatzur, is quite inter-

esting. It reads in part:

The murder of American President John F. Kennedy brought to an abrupt end the massive pressure being applied by the U.S. administration on the government of Israel to discontinue the nuclear program.

Cohen demonstrates at length the pressures applied by Kennedy on Ben-Gurion. He brings the fascinating exchange of letters between the two, in which Kennedy makes it quite clear to the Israeli prime minister that he will under no circumstances agree to Israel becoming a nuclear state.

The book implied that, had Kennedy remained alive, it is doubtful whether Israel would today have a nuclear option.

According to historian Stephen Green: “Perhaps the most significant development of 1963 for the Israeli nuclear weapons program, however, occurred on November 22 on a plane flying from Dallas to Washington, D.C., Lyndon Baines Johnson was sworn in as the 36th President of the United States, following the assassination of John F. Kennedy.”

Green writes: “In the early years of the Johnson administration the Israeli nuclear weapons program was referred to in Washington as ‘the delicate topic.’ Lyndon Johnson’s White House saw no Dimona, heard no Dimona, and spoke no Dimona when the reactor went critical in early 1964.”

Thus it was that the critical point of dispute between John F. Kennedy and the Mossad-dominated government of Israel was no longer an issue. The new American president—so long a partisan of Israel—allowed the nuclear development to continue. This was just the beginning.

Where does the more conventional thesis that the CIA was the prime mover behind the JFK assassination fit alongside the theory that the Mossad was also a key force in the John F.

Kennedy conspiracy?

By 1963 John F. Kennedy was not only at war with Israel and the crime syndicate dominated by Israeli loyalist Meyer Lansky and his Mafia henchmen, but JFK was also at war with their close ally in the international intelligence underworld—the CIA.

The CIA, of course, had its own problems with JFK. Just six weeks before John F. Kennedy was shot, *The New York Times* itself reported that a top Kennedy administration official had warned that a CIA-orchestrated coup in America was a fearful possibility. The CIA—like its allies in Israel—had good reason (in its own perception) to want to see JFK removed from the White House and replaced with Lyndon B. Johnson.

JFK's battle with the CIA over the Bay of Pigs debacle was just the beginning. JFK was—by the last days of his presidency—not only fighting the CIA's efforts to involve the United States ever more deeply in Southeast Asia, but he was also moving toward dismantling the CIA entirely. The CIA's very existence was in danger.

This, of course, has brought focus to the CIA as a likely suspect in the JFK assassination, and it was a course of investigation followed by Jim Garrison.

However, there are other often-mentioned CIA connections to the assassination that also point toward the Mossad.

Note for example that a former mistress of Fidel Castro, CIA asset Marita Lorenz, testified to the U.S. Congress that long-time CIA operative Frank Sturgis, famous as an anti-Castro activist, told her after the assassination that he had been involved in the JFK assassination.

Based on his own extensive study of the JFK assassination, Cuba's former chief of counterintelligence General Fabian Escalante told journalist Claudia Furiati that Cuban intelligence had determined that, in fact, "Sturgis was in charge of communications—receiving and transmitting information on the movement at Dealey Plaza and the motorcade to the shooters and others."

If Sturgis was involved in the actual mechanics of the assas-

sination, the historical evidence suggests that Sturgis could have been functioning as a knowing Mossad tool in the conspiracy.

The truth is that going back some fifteen years prior to the JFK assassination, Sturgis had worked for the Mossad.

Likewise, JFK assassination researcher F. Peter Model said Sturgis was a “Hagannah mercenary during the first (1948) Israeli-Arab war,” and Sturgis also had a girlfriend in Europe in the 1950s who worked for Israeli intelligence and with whom he worked. Sturgis himself said that he assisted his girlfriend as a courier in Europe on a number of her endeavors on behalf of the Mossad.

According to the late Andrew St. George, a former Time-Life correspondent who spent much time in Cuba during and after Castro’s revolution, it was also well known among anti-Castro Cuban exiles that Sturgis had worked for the Mossad, and had done so for a long period of time.

In addition, during the heyday of the CIA’s anti-Castro operations in Miami in which Sturgis was a key figure, some 12 to 16 Mossad agents worked out of Miami under the command of Mossad Deputy Director Yehuda S. Sipper, their influence reaching throughout Latin America and the Caribbean.

Citing a 1976 CIA memo, Professor John Newman, who has investigated CIA knowledge of Lee Harvey Oswald’s activities, says that Sturgis founded the International Anti-Communist Brigade and that “the backers of Sturgis’ group have never been fully established.”

Information outlined by a number of sources suggests that Sturgis’ group could have been an off-shoot of the Mossad’s Miami-based operations, intertwined with Sturgis’ own CIA-sponsored intrigue in the same sphere of influence.

In fact, a unit of Sturgis’ Brigade was CIA contract agent Gerry Patrick Hemming’s so-called “Interpen” that operated outside New Orleans, and Sturgis was connected with those Interpen operations.

Those activities around New Orleans are known to have

involved two of the key players surrounding Lee Harvey Oswald prior to the JFK assassination: CIA contract agents Guy Banister and David Ferrie (both of whom were investigated by Jim Garrison, and both of whom Garrison seems to have definitively linked to Clay Shaw in activities involving intelligence intrigue.)

In fact, there is an Israeli connection to Interpen. According to Hemming himself, Interpen's "most important contact in the United States" was New York financier Theodore Racoosin, whom Hemming described as "one of the key founders of the state of Israel."

Hemming frankly says that although he personally has seen no evidence that convinces him the Mossad participated directly in the JFK assassination, he has said that, "I have known since the late 1960s that the Mossad was aware of the JFK murder *even before it happened*, and they later did a full investigation on the matter and have since retained all such files." [Emphasis added.]

In any case, we *not only* find CIA asset Clay Shaw of New Orleans tied to the Mossad through his association with the Permindex operation (as were Banister and Ferrie), but we *also* find two other CIA-connected players in the anti-Castro operations out of New Orleans (Sturgis and Hemming) were in the Mossad's sphere of influence. And Lee Harvey Oswald is tied to all of the key players involved.

In any event, we now know that at least one person who has reportedly confessed to actual involvement in the JFK assassination—Frank Sturgis—did have multiple long-time links to the Mossad for many years prior to (and after) the time of the JFK assassination.

And so it goes. There's much more to the story. But let us close with this:

Some years ago, an American gentleman met famed CBS newsman Walter Cronkite at Martha's Vineyard. He apprised Cronkite of the theory of Mossad involvement in the JFK assassination, and Cronkite listened carefully.

Looking out to sea, Cronkite remarked quite succinctly: “I can’t think of any group—with the exception of Israeli intelligence—that would have been able to keep the JFK assassination conspiracy under wraps for so long.”

The evidence demonstrates that there is a very strong foundation for the thesis. It is a scenario that does make sense, much to the dismay of many critics. The scenario comes closer than anything yet written in summarizing the entirety of the JFK assassination conspiracy.

This admittedly “unusual” and certainly controversial reconstruction of the JFK assassination conspiracy takes a new look at a very big jigsaw puzzle that displays a remarkably complex and somewhat murky picture.

On the immensely confusing picture on the front of the puzzle are all of the various groups and individuals implicated in the JFK assassination conspiracy. However, when one turns the puzzle over, there is a large and very clear picture of the Israeli flag to be found.

CHAPTER ELEVEN

Controversy Surrounds *Final Judgment* Author

*In the summer of 1997, there arose a major controversy, noted in newspapers across the country, surrounding the fact that Michael Collins Piper had been invited to speak at a small community college in Orange County, California on the topic of his book, *Final Judgment*, which documented the role of Israel's intelligence service, the Mossad, in the assassination of President John F. Kennedy. The primary force in the effort to prevent Piper from speaking was the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith. What follows is a commentary prepared by Piper in response to the controversy which was subsequently published in The Orange County Register.*

Speakers on the JFK assassination have been popular on American campuses for 30 years. Yet the thesis of my book—*Final Judgment*—is one that some don't want students to hear: that Israel's spy agency, the Mossad, played a role with the CIA and the Lansky Crime Syndicate in the murder of President Kennedy.

My book is not yet "banned in Boston," but it is banned in Orange County, so it seems. The very week (Sept. 20-27, 1997) the American Library Association and the National Association of College Stores sponsored "Banned Books Week," controversy raged in Orange County because some were upset that Steve Frogue, president of the South Orange County Community College District (SOCCD) trustees, had invited me to discuss *Final Judgment* at an SOCCD seminar on the JFK assassination.

Although heavy-handed lobbying forced cancellation of the

seminar, there's now a well-funded drive to remove Frogue from office for believing in our Constitution's guarantee that Americans have the right to express differing points of view.

Israeli diplomat Uri Palti says *Final Judgment* is "nonsense." Yet, contradictorily, critics still declare my discoveries "dangerous," and say that my findings shouldn't be heard by "impressionable" kids who might take a "crackpot" seriously.

Although Orange County students are evidently not viewed as sufficiently mature to judge my theory for themselves, they are considered ripe enough to join the military and die in the Persian Gulf, Bosnia, Somalia, or other choice places around the globe.

Here's what's revealing: my critics (such as Roy Bauer of Irvine Valley College) absolutely *refuse* to debate. They won't grab the opportunity to show—point-by-point—where I'm wrong. No wonder—in light of the hysterical reaction to *Final Judgment*—that some think maybe the book has indeed "pinned the tail on the donkey," that my critics "protesteth too much."

Many in Orange County have heard about *La Affaire Frogue*, but few actually know anything about *Final Judgment*—what it says or what it does not.

Final Judgment is 769 pages in length, clearly documented with more than 1,000 footnotes. Content analysis will confirm that 85% of the 111 bibliographic sources are from "mainstream" publishers and constitute the primary basis for substantive material cited. Three minor errors—none relevant to the thesis—have been found.

Unfortunately, because of what critics allege, many people believe I "deny the Holocaust" (which is not true). Therefore, the specious argument goes; anything I say about the JFK assassination necessarily has to be—according to SOCCD trustee Marcia Milchiker—"nonsense" and "lies," *even though the Holocaust and the JFK assassination are two entirely unrelated subjects.*

This (clever) tactic shifts attention away from what I really do say. However, for the record, my book does not discuss the

Holocaust. Here is what *Final Judgment* contends:

In 1963, JFK was embroiled in a bitter (then secret) conflict with Israeli leader David Ben-Gurion over Israel's drive to build the atomic bomb; that Ben-Gurion resigned in disgust, having told JFK that because of JFK's policies, Israel's "existence [was] in danger." Then upon JFK's assassination, U.S. policy toward Israel began an immediate 180-degree turnaround.

This is all documented by Pulitzer Prize winner Seymour Hersh in *The Samson Option*, by James Cockburn in *Dangerous Liaison*, and by Stephen Green in *Taking Sides*—each a respected historian.

Where, then, is the "Israeli connection" to the assassination? The fact is that when New Orleans DA Jim Garrison prosecuted Clay Shaw with conspiracy in the JFK assassination, Garrison (unknowingly) stumbled upon the Mossad link.

Although (after his acquittal) Shaw was exposed as a CIA asset, Shaw was involved in 1963 in covert activities with high-level Mossad officer Tibor Rosenbaum, whose Swiss bank laundered mob money for Meyer Lansky, "chairman" of the crime syndicate.

Some say "the Mafia killed JFK." In fact, the Mafia bosses accused of "whacking" JFK—Carlos Marcello and Santo Trafficante—were not only Lansky subordinates, but also CIA collaborators in plots against Fidel Castro.

And while many accuse the CIA's James Angleton of a role in the assassination cover-up, none mention that Angleton, the CIA's Mossad liaison, was a devoted partisan of Israel.

Why didn't Oliver Stone mention these details in his film, *JFK*? Perhaps because *JFK* was financed by the Mossad's Arnon Milchan; Israel's biggest arms dealer.

All this is the tip of the iceberg. In light of the hysteria over *Final Judgment*, recall JFK's words: "A nation that is afraid to let its people judge the truth and falsehood in an open market is a nation that is afraid of its people."

Publisher's Note: Ultimately, although the JFK seminar in question was canceled, Piper journeyed to Orange County and visited Saddleback College where the freedom-oriented students on the school newspaper invited Piper to speak at a private seminar in their private classroom—openly defying the “thought police” at the Anti-Defamation League. So Piper—and the students—had the last laugh.

CHAPTER TWELVE

Peter Jennings and *The Kennedy Assassination – Beyond Conspiracy*

The late Peter Jennings of ABC and his behind-the-scenes puppet masters at the ABC network have obviously taken the American people for fools. *ABC Nightly News* anchor Peter Jennings lost whatever credibility he once had on the night of November 20, 2003. On that evening, with much fanfare, ABC News presented a two-hour documentary on the assassination of President John F. Kennedy hosted by Jennings.

Entitled *The Kennedy Assassination—Beyond Conspiracy*, the documentary spent two hours providing half-truths and distortions and flat-out endorsing the Warren Commission’s long-ago discredited theory that Lee Harvey Oswald, acting alone, carried out the assassination of America’s 35th president.

One thing should be said up front: the key to divining who really killed JFK can now best be determined by looking at the way the elite media has reported upon his assassination, and then looking at who actually controls the media.

Once that is determined, the source of the conspiracy and its cover-up can immediately be ascertained. With that in mind, let’s look at what ABC—now a subsidiary of the Hollywood empire of Michael Eisner’s Disney Company—had to say.

Peter Jennings launched the broadcast by referring to conspiracy theorists being “beyond the pale,” and then spent the next two hours attempting to prove it—largely by ignoring the truth.

Asserting that there is “not a single piece of credible evidence to prove a conspiracy” behind the assassination, Jennings effectively ignored the hard work and dedication of literally thousands of independent investigators (and even researchers for the mid-1970s House Assassinations Committee inquiry) who unearthed a vast array of

material that seriously contradicts virtually all of the key findings of the Warren Commission.

Never once did ABC bother to bring forth even a single one of the many prominent and respected critics who emerged over the past forty years to raise questions about the “lone gunman” legend. Never once did any prominent Warren Commission critics appear onscreen, nor were they even mentioned.

The best ABC could do was briefly pass over a selection of books critical of the Warren Commission—notable among them, Mark Lane’s pioneering *Rush to Judgment*. But neither Lane nor any other Commission critic appeared on the program.

Instead, each and every individual interviewed by ABC who expressed any kind of opinion on the matter whatsoever was fully in support of the Warren Commission’s conclusions. And most of those interviewed by ABC had some axe to grind in the first place. They included:

- Robert Goldman, a university professor who has written a book declaiming any form of “conspiracy theory” on the subject, proclaiming such theories to be harmful. (Goldman’s book, by the way, included an attack on Michael Collins Piper, the author of this review);

- Hugh Aynesworth, a journalist with a long record of close association with the FBI;

- Gerald Posner, a widely-touted Wall Street lawyer whose shoddy book, *Case Closed*, endorsing the Warren Commission (which was written with support from the CIA) is notoriously rife with errors;

- Priscilla Johnson MacMillan, a journalist with long-time CIA connections, who was touted as “Oswald’s biographer”;

- James Hosty, the former Dallas FBI agent who was assigned to Oswald after Oswald’s return from the Soviet Union. (Hosty—by the way—was the local bureau’s “specialist” on “right wing extremists” and in such a position would have served as liaison to the “extremist hunters” at the Anti-Defamation League

(ADL) of B'nai B'rith);

- Michael and Ruth Paine—the shadowy Dallas couple who “befriended” Oswald and his family. It was Mrs. Paine who got Oswald a job at the Texas School Book Depository one month before the JFK assassination—a fact acknowledged by ABC. What ABC did not mention was that many researchers have documented likely intelligence connections of both Mr. and Mrs. Paine, an unusual couple whose full story has yet to be told.

And for good measure, ABC even brought in Hillel Silverman, the Dallas rabbi who was spiritual counsel to Jack Ruby, the mob-connected nightclub keeper who gunned Oswald down two days after the president’s assassination.

Rabbi Silverman assured the audience that Ruby was not part of any conspiracy and thought that he was doing a good deed—ignoring the fact that there is at least one brief filmed tape of Ruby hinting broadly that there was a conspiracy and saying that he had been “used,” and that the full truth would never be known.

One particularly intriguing ABC “witness” proving Oswald’s guilt was one Volkmar Schmidt, whose association with Oswald was never described by ABC—and probably for good reason: It would raise too many questions.

However, long-time JFK assassination researchers recognized Schmidt: a German émigré who fled his native land after involvement in a plot to kill Adolf Hitler, Schmidt was introduced to Oswald by the mysterious Russian aristocrat, George DeMohrenschildt, widely believed to be—for at least part of the time after Oswald first returned to Texas—Oswald’s “CIA babysitter.”

Schmidt, it is said, had a particular fascination with hypnosis, a point that some who believed Oswald may have been groomed as a “Manchurian Candidate” assassin (or fall guy) have always found intriguing.

Later, Schmidt introduced Oswald to the aforementioned Michael and Ruth Paine whom, many believe, took over for

DeMohrenschildt in keeping an eye on Oswald for the CIA.

Although ABC never interviewed Oswald's widow—who now says that she believes that there was a conspiracy and that her husband was not the assassin, but was instead the “patsy” as Oswald himself proclaimed, ABC did bring in Oswald's older brother Robert, who proclaimed belief in his brother's guilt.

What ABC did not mention, however, was that there have been many Warren Commission critics who have raised serious questions about somewhat suspicious past statements made by Robert Oswald himself that were used to “prove” his brother's guilt.

Nor did ABC mention the possibility—raised by some assassination investigators—that there were multiple CIA connections even with the Oswald family itself, possibly even his own mother, adding fuel to the fire that the CIA had its “eye” on Oswald for many years prior to the JFK assassination.

In that regard, ABC's suggestion that Oswald was “a man nobody really knew” is quite laughable. Professor John Newman of the University of Maryland, in his landmark work, *Oswald and the CIA*, demonstrates conclusively that the CIA had extensive files on Oswald, most of which, incidentally, were “handled” by the CIA's famed chief of counterintelligence, James J. Angleton, the devoted Israeli loyalist who was the CIA's one-man liaison to Israel's intelligence agency, the Mossad.

Based on the theme that conspiracy theories emerged regarding the JFK assassination because, in Peter Jennings' pronouncement, the American people felt that “something so horrible had to be the work of more than one man,” the ABC conspiracy-debunking was sometimes quite egregious in ignoring the facts. In one instance, ABC claimed that witnesses saw Dallas Police Officer J. D. Tippit “motion Oswald over” before “Oswald” shot Tippit.

However, the truth is that there are multiple conflicting stories even about the circumstances surrounding the Tippit mur-

der—which took place shortly after the JFK assassination—and it is far from certain that Oswald even committed that crime.

When ABC finally decided to explore the fact that there were indeed concerns about a conspiracy behind the president's murder, ABC did not delve into the most commonly-held belief—that the conspiracy was most likely traceable (as indeed it was and is) to elements inside the CIA.

Instead, ABC went to great lengths to prove that it wasn't a Soviet conspiracy, even bringing on a famous Soviet defector, Yuri Nosenko, to assert that “no way” would the Soviets have ever used Oswald. In truth, very few critics of the Warren Commission ever thought that it was a Soviet conspiracy in the first place.

Actually, critics of the Commission alleged that the real conspirators behind the assassination had deliberately attempted to link Oswald to the Soviets (and to Cuban dictator Fidel Castro) for one of a number of possible purposes: to either force an official cover-up to “prevent war with the Soviet Union” or to otherwise provoke a U.S. invasion of Cuba in retaliation against Castro. In any case, the idea that either the Soviets or Castro “did it” was never held seriously among most Commission critics.

In examining Oswald's mysterious sojourn in the Soviet Union—where many believe he was a CIA operative—ABC insisted that the Soviets never took Oswald too seriously one way or the other and that, despite ABC's repeated proclamation that Oswald was a “nobody,” the Soviet authorities still “caved in” and allowed Oswald to stay in the Soviet Union when, after being asked to leave he staged a suicide attempt shortly following his arrival. The idea that the Soviets would have “caved in” to such a ‘nobody’ is a silly proposition at best. Obviously, for whatever reason, the Soviets decided it might be worth their while to keep an eye on Oswald. But ABC didn't want its audience to consider that possibility.

In discussing Oswald's equally mysterious period in New Orleans (prior to his final return to Dallas before the JFK assassination), ABC never once mentioned Oswald's very clear associ-

ation with ex-FBI man Guy Banister and his fellow CIA contract operative David Ferrie. ABC mentions, with some awe, that Oswald managed to gain some “fleeting” fame in his public pose as a pro-Castro street agitator while being interviewed on both television and radio as he distributed pro-Castro leaflets.

And it might be mentioned that the local NBC television and radio affiliates that helped spread Oswald’s fame at the time were owned by Edith and Edgar Stern—major players in the pro-Israel lobby and close friends of Clay Shaw, later implicated by New Orleans District Attorney Jim Garrison in the circumstances surrounding the manipulation of Oswald in New Orleans prior to the assassination. But, of course, ABC didn’t mention that.

ABC talks of Oswald’s trip to Mexico and brings on former House Assassinations Committee investigator Edwin Lopez to demonstrate that there was no evidence that Oswald was plotting with either the Soviets or the Cubans in the JFK assassination.

That’s all well and good. However, what ABC didn’t mention was that critics of the Warren Commission consider Lopez a hero precisely because the entirety of Lopez’ thorough investigations actually effectively proved that it was the CIA—specifically the office of counterintelligence chief James Angleton—that was working in the months prior to the JFK assassination to link Oswald to the Soviets. In short, ABC was taking only a portion of what Lopez had uncovered and was distorting it for the television audience.

A highlight of the ABC presentation was a colorful computerized graphic (quite entertaining) of the Kennedy assassination which purported to “prove” that a single shot did indeed drill through President Kennedy and then into Texas Governor John B. Connally.

What ABC did not mention was that, in the past, author Gerald Posner had touted a similar computerized simulation proving the same point. But Posner did not mention in his book, *Case Closed*, that the same company which produced that simulation

also produced another simulation demonstrating how more than one gunman could indeed have been involved in the John F. Kennedy assassination.

However, when it came to the question of JFK's head wound, which most serious critics believe was fired from the front (and therefore, obviously not by Lee Harvey Oswald or anyone in the Texas School Book Depository), ABC's computerized simulation simply showed the obvious fact: that the back of JFK's head was in the line of fire of the book building.

ABC's Jennings' lamely explained that the reason why JFK's head shot violently backward (as if he had been shot from the front) was because, Jennings claimed, bodies can move in any direction when they receive a bullet. Or so he said. Most hunters, police officers, soldiers and others who use firearms would probably say otherwise.

When ABC was forced to confront the fact that the 1976 House Assassinations Committee ultimately concluded (based on a sound recording made in Dealey Plaza) that there had been a second gunman firing from the front, it summoned its computerized simulation to show only that the police officer (whose radio microphone recorded the gunshots) could not—or so the simulation showed—have been where the sound experts had concluded it had been at the time the recording was made. In other words, the ABC computer wizardry did not disprove that there was a shot fired from the front—only that the recording of the shot was not made from where it was presumed to have been made.

ABC did make an attempt to discredit House Assassinations Committee Director Robert Blakey's "theory" that "the Mafia" killed Kennedy, but ABC was actually only discrediting another theory that was never taken seriously in the first place.

As for Blakey himself, although he continually claimed that Dallas mob figure Jack Ruby was tied up with "the Mafia," Blakey studiously ignored Ruby's genuine connections to the non-Italian crime syndicate of Meyer Lansky and his partners, the

Bronfmans. This is no surprise since Blakey, at one point, was actually a paid “consultant” to Lansky syndicate figure Morris Dalitz, the Lansky mob’s chief point man in Las Vegas.

When it came to addressing Hollywood’s Oliver Stone and his controversial film, *JFK*, Jennings and ABC could only point out, quite correctly, that Stone had, by his own admission, engaged in quite a bit of “dramatic license” in presenting his film on the Jim Garrison investigation of the aforementioned Clay Shaw.

The truth is that many serious JFK assassination researchers have been highly critical of Stone and his film. This author was among the first to point out that Stone’s film was financed by Arnon Milchan, an Israeli arms dealer who has been a key figure in Israel’s nuclear weapons development program—the very program that JFK was so determined to stop dead in its tracks.

ABC’s parting shot at Stone (and Garrison) was presenting a clip from the film in which Garrison (played by actor Kevin Costner) is making a dramatic speech. ABC’s Jennings remarks wryly: “The real Jim Garrison never made this speech,” thereby suggesting that anything even remotely associated with the film or with Garrison is therefore somehow “not real.”

There is much more that could be said—and will be said by many others—about this shameful propaganda from Peter Jennings and his boss, Michael Eisner, head of Disney, the Hollywood giant that now controls ABC. But suffice it to say: the real key to understanding who really killed JFK, and why, can best be understood by examining the way the American media has so thoroughly devoted itself to the cover-up of that conspiracy.

Thus: the answer to the simple question, “Who controls the media” points toward a solution to the question of: “Who really killed JFK—and why?”

CHAPTER THIRTEEN

Did the Chicago Mafia Really Have a Hand in Killing JFK?

If you think infamous Italian-American “Mafia” figure Sam Giancana was the “big man” behind the mob in Chicago, you’re going to be in for a surprise.

Double Deal, by Michael Corbitt, adds remarkable validation to the thesis that Israel’s Mossad was a key player alongside the CIA and organized crime in the assassination of President John F. Kennedy.

This eye-opening book bares new facts about the secret history of the famed Chicago “Mafia,” revealing certain significant never-before-told details that cast a whole new light on many major events that shaped American life (and foreign policy) during the second half of the 20th century.

The author, Corbitt—the “mobbed-up” former chief of police of Willow Springs, Illinois (a Chicago suburb)—has joined writer Sam Giancana—nephew and namesake of legendary Chicago Mafia boss Sam Giancana—in producing a startling 347-page expose that unveils, for the first time ever, the surprising identity of the little-known “mystery man” who was the real “power behind the throne” in organized crime in Chicago, and whose influence reached all the way to Israel, Panama, Iran, Las Vegas and Washington, D.C.

Corbitt—who spent a lengthy stretch in prison after being convicted on federal racketeering charges, the culmination of a lifetime of involvement in organized crime—admits freely to his own many misdeeds and makes no claims of innocence. He acknowledges using his status as a small-town police chief to advancing the interests of the mob. His first-hand (and often chilling) accounts of life

in the mob parallels many previously-told stories.

Despite his famous “Mafia” name, Corbitt’s co-author, Giancana, was never involved in the “family business,” and some years ago he wrote *Double Cross*, a best-selling account of the life and crimes of his late uncle, who was murdered in 1975.

However, what makes the new Corbitt-Giancana book unique is that the authors dare to say something that has never been published anywhere before: that a shadowy non-Italian gangster named Hyman “Hal” Lerner was the continuing behind-the-scenes force guiding the Chicago mob for over thirty years.

Despite the media-ballyhooed “revolving door” of Italian-American Mafia bosses such as Giancana and others who were alternately jailed or “whacked,” it was Lerner who was the man continually in charge.

Beyond that, the authors reveal that much of Lerner’s criminal activity was conducted not only in concert with the CIA, but also, in particular, with Israel’s Mossad.

Lerner was not just a major figure in Chicago crime, but on the international scene as well. He was also not only a top (although certainly lesser-known) long-time associate of Jewish crime chief Meyer Lansky (a known Mossad collaborator), but effectively Lansky’s successor when Lansky died in 1983.

According to Corbitt, he learned early on, during his mob days, of Lerner’s existence, although Lerner’s presence so high up in the mob was something neither government investigators nor a mob-captivated media wanted to focus on. Corbitt writes:

All the other Outfit guys were in the papers every day, their pictures plastered all over the front page of the *Tribune*. But when Hy Lerner’s name was mentioned in the papers, he was described only as an “associate” or “protégé” of some gangster and nothing more than that. Nobody knew how deep his contacts went or how high up. Reporters called him a “riddle” and a “mystery man.”

As Corbitt himself advanced in organized crime circles under the patronage of Giancana, he ultimately began to learn the secret of how and why the Chicago mob was able to operate so freely. It was their partnership with the Mossad—running guns to Israel—that gave the Chicago mob its “get out of jail free” card as far as U.S. government officials were concerned:

At the insistence of Meyer Lansky, [Giancana] and his pals started working with the Israeli Mossad, smuggling weapons into the Middle East.

Everything was coming in and out of Panama, which meant that everything was being handled by Hy Lerner. Lerner was without a doubt Sam Giancana’s most trusted financial advisor. He had everybody who was anybody in Panama—from bankers to generals—eating out of his hand. Once they started running guns to Israel, Lerner also had the U.S. military and its airstrips at his disposal.

And contrary to popular legend, it was not Giancana nor another famed Chicago mobster, Johnny Roselli, who cemented the now infamous CIA-Mafia plots to kill Castro. It was Lerner, along with his partner, Meyer Lansky.

In addition, Corbitt and Giancana reveal, Lerner’s associations with other crime figures such as New Orleans mob boss Carlos Marcello and Santo Trafficante of Tampa were equally intimate.

Lerner and the two southern Mafia figures were engaged in lucrative guns and drug smuggling operations in the Caribbean, not to mention mob gambling enterprises. And as far as Lerner’s association with Lansky, Corbitt writes:

They were both absolutely brilliant when it came to handling money, probably the best the mob had ever seen. They were also Zionists, passionate defenders of the divine right of Jews to occupy the Holy Land of Jerusalem. You wouldn’t think a person’s religion would make any difference, not when

it came to a deal like the one organized crime had with the CIA.

But Hy Lerner and Meyer Lansky weren't just Zionists; they were also mobsters who believed the end justifies the means. Put organized crime and the U.S. government at their disposal and you've got a very powerful force, a force that's capable of changing the face of the mob—and the world.

Lerner and Giancana were also engaged in gambling deals with casinos based in Iran, then the fiefdom of the Shah of Iran whose infamous secret police, SAVAK, was a joint creation of the CIA and the Mossad—a major point of contention when Islamic fundamentalists overthrew the Shah and forced him into exile.

Corbitt also reveals the amazing story of how Giancana (with Lerner's help) finally got the U.S. Justice Department off his back.

It turns out that as much as President Lyndon Johnson and his Zionist advisors wanted to wage war against Egypt and the other Arab states on behalf of Israel, U.S. entanglement in Vietnam made it impossible for Johnson to act.

However, Giancana not only put up a substantial amount of money to help arm Israel for its 1967 war against the Arab countries, but in addition, Lerner and Giancana arranged shipments of stolen weapons to Israel from one of their outposts in Panama, an operation conducted in league with the Mossad's Panamanian-based operative, Michael Harari.

In return for this service on behalf of Israel, President Johnson ordered the Justice Department to drop its campaign against Giancana.

In the end, though, the arrangement between Giancana and Lerner came to an end. Lerner, it appears, was almost certainly behind Giancana's 1975 murder. Lerner, however, continued to thrive, even as a series of Giancana's successors were faced with a continuing series of federal prosecutions, widely hailed by the media as "the end of the mob in Chicago."

During his years in the mob, Corbitt often acted as a courier for Larner, traveling to Las Vegas, Central America and elsewhere and, according to Corbitt, he is now certain that many of Larner's activities were very much a central part of the now-infamous Iran-contra affair that rocked the Reagan-Bush administration during the 1980s.

Corbitt finally went down on corruption charges and ended up in prison. But he was bitter at his mob allies whom he felt had betrayed him. He offered to help the FBI put Larner away.

However, in 1997, just when it appeared the move against Larner was underway, Corbitt was told by the FBI that the State Department had intervened and quashed the investigation. As Corbitt explained, "It seemed my old pal Mr. Larner had some very influential friends."

In fact, this was not the first time that higher-ups in the federal government ordered the FBI, the IRS, and the DEA, jointly and individually, to cease their inquiries into Larner's affairs, and it wouldn't be the last.

Although Panamanian newspapers announced in 1991 that Larner had died, rumors surfaced several years later that Larner was actually very much alive, living in Flathead, Montana.

Then, just as Corbitt's book was ready to go to press, the *Miami Herald* announced that Larner had died on Oct. 12, 2002 and was going to be buried in Skokie, Illinois. As Giancana puts it simply and tellingly:

Strangely there were no front-page headlines heralding the death of one of the nation's most powerful mobsters.

So whether Larner is alive or is finally dead doesn't really matter. According to Giancana:

What does matter is that the illicit alliance he and his cronies forged some fifty years ago with

international leaders and rogue elements within U.S. intelligence and the military is alive ... Federal agencies know the perpetrators' names. They know where they live. And still, they do nothing.

Double Deal is an amazing book that will make you think twice about what you thought you knew about a wide variety of topics, ranging from the “Mafia” to the JFK assassination to Iran-contra and the whole story of CIA arms-and-guns smuggling and much, much more. All, it seems, apparently have one common, but little-known, thread: the long-hidden Israeli connection.

CHAPTER FOURTEEN

Mossad Linked to Martin Luther King Assassination

A key player in the assassination of Martin Luther King, Jr. has been linked to a key figure in the JFK assassination conspiracy. Both, in turn, have been firmly connected to joint involvement in a U.S.-based arms smuggling operation intimately tied to Israel's intelligence service, the Mossad.

This revelation appears in a new book, *An Act of State*, by Dr. William F. Pepper, which—unless something more explosive comes along—will probably be the last word on the subject of who killed King and why.

Based on Pepper's investigations in his long-time role as the attorney for King's accused killer, James Earl Ray, *An Act of State* does not trumpet the Mossad connection by any means.

However, Pepper's circumspect reference to the Mossad is a lightning bolt of recall to anyone who has already read *Final Judgment*, the first book ever to not only document a Mossad role in the JFK affair, but to also raise the likelihood of possible Israeli involvement in the King assassination.

Pepper's assertion involving the Mossad is based on statements made to one of Pepper's investigators by former Colonel John Downie of the 902nd Military Intelligence Group, a unit based inside the Department of Defense.

According to Downie, the mysterious figure "Raul"—whom King's accused assassin, James Earl Ray, claimed had helped frame him (Ray) for King's murder—was part of a U.S.-based international arms smuggling operation (operating, in part, in Texas) that Pepper had already determined—through other sources—involved Jack Ruby, the Dallas nightclub keeper who killed JFK's accused assassin, Lee Harvey Oswald.

The link between “Raul” and Ruby was by no means tenuous: “Raul” and Ruby were placed together by Pepper’s sources on numerous occasions prior to the JFK assassination—five years before King’s murder.

The smuggling operation utilized weapons stolen from U.S. Army bases and armories which were delivered to the New Orleans-based Carlos Marcello organized crime organization which, in turn, delivered those arms for sale in Latin and South America and elsewhere. The proceeds from the arms deals were reportedly split equally with the U.S. 902nd Military Intelligence Group using its cut for financing covert, off-budget operations.

Here is the Mossad connection: Downie said that one of the individuals—a key player in this operation—was “a senior Mossad agent working in South America who acted as a senior liaison to the U.S. military and CIA.”

It appears *Final Judgment* has almost certainly pinpointed the identity of the individual described by Pepper’s source.

In *Final Judgment*, I pointed out that the famous “umbrella man” who was photographed in Dealey Plaza in Dallas on Nov. 22, 1963 bore a remarkable resemblance to no less than the now-infamous (but then shadowy) long-time Mossad figure, Michael Harari.

In 1963, Harari was in the field as a top Mossad assassinations specialist and would have assuredly been in Dallas if, as *Final Judgment* contends, the Mossad was a prime player in the JFK conspiracy. In addition, the published record documents that—throughout his career—Harari was heavily involved in Israeli intelligence operations in Mexico, South America and the Caribbean, culminating in his later more widely-publicized role as the top advisor to then-Panamanian dictator Manuel Noriega, who was ultimately toppled in a U.S. invasion.

Was Harari, then, the “senior Mossad agent working in South America” referenced by Pepper’s U.S. military source? If not, it was certainly someone Harari worked with.

That Jack Ruby—who was part of the Mossad-connected smuggling operation uncovered by Pepper—had multiple Mossad and Israeli connections is no surprise to those who have read *Final Judgment*, which pointed out:

- That contrary to myth, Ruby was not a henchman for the Italian-American “Mafia,” but was instead a long-time key narcotics smuggling functionary in the crime syndicate of mob chieftain and Israeli loyalist Meyer Lansky;
- That Ruby bragged as far back as 1955—according to FBI files—that he had been smuggling arms to Israel;
- That Luis Kutner, Ruby’s long-time attorney—dating back to Ruby’s earlier years in Chicago—had deep-rooted intelligence connections and was a major player in the pro-Israel lobby;
- That Al Lizanetz, a top henchman of Arizona crime boss Kemper Marley (a well-paid front man for the Bronfman bootlegging family, early partners of Meyer Lansky), had asserted that Ruby—operating in Texas—was also on the Bronfman payroll;
- That the night before the JFK assassination Ruby met with a close friend, Lawrence Meyers, who had been connected to a firm linked by the FBI to arms smuggling for Israel.

So although Ruby’s Mossad ties have been buried by other writers on the JFK assassination, the details can be found in *Final Judgment*.

In fact, there are other strange Israeli connections swirling around the King assassination that have received little attention.

In his earlier book on the King assassination, *Orders to Kill*, William Pepper described the background of Canadian Eric Galt, whose identity James Earl Ray adopted during his wide-ranging travels. Galt, it seems, ran a warehouse that housed a top secret munitions project funded by the CIA, the U.S. Naval Surface Weapons Center, and the Army Electronics Research and Development Command. The work involved the production and storage of ‘proximity fuses’ used in surface-to-air missiles and artillery shells.

In August 1967, Pepper reported, Galt was “cooperating with another 902 [Military Intelligence Group] operation that involved the theft of some of these proximity fuses and their covert delivery to Israel.” According to Pepper, he obtained “a confidential memorandum issued by the 902nd MIG on 17 October 1967 which confirms and discusses this operation, Project MEXPO, which was defined as a ‘military material exploitation project of the Scientific and Technical Division (S&T) . . . in Israel.’”

So through means by which today still remain a mystery; the “patsy” in the King assassination was using the identity of an individual who had ties to Israel and its “scientific and technical” research—which, of course, points in the direction of nuclear development. Note, likewise, that Galt was linked to the “scientific and technical division” in Israel.

It is also a matter of record (but seldom mentioned) that prior to the King assassination, Ray had been given two numbers by his handler, “Raul,” that Raul indicated Ray might contact if necessary. Ray later determined that the New Orleans number was that of the Laventhal Marine Supply company; and in his little-mentioned, self-written early appeal of his conviction, Ray asserted that “the resident listed in New Orleans was, among other things, an agent of a Mid-East organization distressed because of King’s reported, forthcoming, before his death, public support of the Palestinian Arab cause.” Of course, Ray was referring to the Anti-Defamation League (ADL) of B’nai B’rith.

Later, when Ray testified before the House Assassinations Committee he referred to this mystery number and commented, “I don’t want to get into this libel area again and say something that might be embarrassing to—disservice some group or organizations . . . he [King] intended, like Vietnam, to support the Arab cause . . . someone in his organization making contact with the Palestinians for an alliance.” Again, Ray was obviously talking about King taking a stand that would upset the ADL, although he

was talking around the subject without stating it directly.

The fact that the ADL was targeting King surprised many of King's admirers and his detractors, particularly since King has often been praised publicly by the ADL, particularly in its publications that are aimed at black audiences.

The first public revelation that the ADL had been spying on King came in the April 28, 1993 issue of *The San Francisco Weekly*—a liberal “alternative” journal—which reported:

During the civil rights movement, when many Jews were taking the lead in fighting against racism, the ADL was spying on Martin Luther King and passing on the information to J. Edgar Hoover, a former ADL employee said.

“It was common and casually accepted knowledge,” said Henry Schwarzschild, who worked in the publications department of the ADL between 1962 and 1964.

“They thought King was sort of a loose cannon,” said Schwarzschild. “He was a Baptist preacher and nobody could be quite sure what he would do next. The ADL was very anxious about having an unguided missile out there.”

In regard to the ADL, Pepper's new book lets drop another interesting detail: it turns out the ADL was said to have maintained a large file (which the ADL denied existed) on a certain General Henry Cobb who worked to sabotage Pepper's efforts to exonerate James Earl Ray.

Pepper does not speculate as to why the ADL had this file on Cobb, but one might conclude that the material could have been used to “convince” Cobb to “cooperate” in the King assassination cover-up.


Pepper's thesis is that King's actual assassin—possibly a Memphis police officer—was contracted for the hit through Frank

Liberto, a wealthy Memphis associate of the New Orleans-based Marcello crime family (itself a key link in the Israeli-connected Lansky crime syndicate) but that—even as the crime was being carried out—U.S. military snipers were on the scene, observing events and providing possible back-up should King survive the “civilian” assault. His book prevents a chilling and quite thoroughly documented scenario. However, the obvious Israeli thread that runs throughout the scenario is not something that Pepper is likely to elaborate upon.

Whatever one’s opinions of Martin Luther King, there is no question that he was intent upon expanding beyond his race-based “civil rights” ventures into the field of U.S. foreign policy—a definite problem indeed for the powers-that-be. It was precisely this that led to his assassination.

SECTION THREE

Interviews



CHAPTER FIFTEEN

Reality Radio Network **The “Lost” *Final Judgment* Interview** **June 9, 2003**

Victor Thorn: Michael, let's begin this interview by talking about *Final Judgment*. Let me set this up a little bit by going back to 1992. There was an Illinois representative named Paul Findley, and he said that of all the books that have been written about the Kennedy assassination, none—or maybe only a few—had ever mentioned the Mossad having any part in this assassination. At this point there have been so many books written about the assassination that even Elvis has been fingered. So, they were the only ones who went unscathed for 30 years until January, 1994 when your book came out. The name of the book is *Final Judgment: The Missing Link in the JFK Assassination Conspiracy*. So, with that brief intro, tell us what the reaction was when this book came out.

Michael Collins Piper: Let me give you a little background of how I came about writing it, because I think it's very important. There have been a lot of books, not just about the Kennedy assassination, but about Kennedy's foreign policy that dealt with the Bay of Pigs in Cuba, that dealt with his relations with the Soviet Union, and of course certainly books about JFK's policies in Southeast Asia. But until the early 1990's, there was nothing written about JFK's relations with Israel and the Arab world. In fact, until this past month, there was not a single book written about JFK's Middle East policy. Now, a book on that very specific subject has come out.

But in the early 1990's, I happened to be reading several books, one by Pulitzer Prize winner Seymour Hersh that talked about Israel's nuclear arms program; one by Stephen Green (*Taking Sides: America's Secret Relations with a Militant Israel*),

and one by Andrew and Leslie Cockburn, a husband and wife team, called *Dangerous Liaisons*, talking about the U.S. covert relationship with Israel's intelligence agency, the Mossad. The one thread that I found in all three of these books, which were kind of an overview of the topic, was despite public perception to the contrary, John F. Kennedy was, in fact, at very severe odds with the government of Israel up until the time of his assassination.

I started looking into that subject, saying "My goodness, of all the possible suspects that have been brought up, I realized at that point in all the literature about the Kennedy assassination itself, no one had ever considered the possibility that Israel might have participated in the assassination. The reason why was because John F. Kennedy was trying to stop Israel from building the nuclear bomb. And that is significant because of the fact that Israel's entire defense policy, their national defense, was built around the theme of nuclear defense. And there was John F. Kennedy trying to stop them from reaching their goals.

And on that foundation, I started pursuing the standard literature on the JFK assassination topic, and of course, you find various names and people often mentioned as possible suspects. These people were called right-wingers, anti-Communists; they were with the CIA, or they were conservatives, or what have you. But the one thing that I found that was never mentioned—and this includes the so-called "Mafia"—the one thing that I never found mentioned was in most of the cases of significant players or actors—was their connections to not just the Israeli Lobby, but very distinct connections to Israeli intelligence. Those same Israeli intelligence connections intersected with the American organized crime elements and with the CIA, the very names most often publicly mentioned in connection with the JFK assassination.

That's what my book is all about. I put it all together. As I described it, I say it's kind of like the secret picture on the other side of the jigsaw puzzle. You look at a jigsaw puzzle and see all these seemingly disparate connections: the Mafia, organized

crime, even elements of the Ku Klux Klan and the right-wing in New Orleans. All these people were supposedly fingered at one time or another, and in fact, if you look on the other side of the jigsaw puzzle, you see that they're all connected. And what the real picture is on the other side of the puzzle is the Israeli flag. That upset a lot of people.

Victor Thorn: You show an intricate involvement between the four key players: the Mossad, the CIA, Lansky's organized crime syndicate, who you say is the one who heads the whole thing instead of the Italians—and finally, the media with this organization called Perminindex floating around in the center of it all. But getting back to Israel, you say that they had the means, the opportunity, and most importantly, the motive to be involved in this assassination precisely because they wanted to become a nuclear power.

Michael Collins Piper: I guess that's what makes it look very timely because we just fought a war in the Middle East that doesn't quite seem to be over yet because of allegations that Saddam Hussein had all these weapons of mass destruction. But I'll tell you what: it doesn't look like he had the weapons of mass destruction. Of course, we knew that. What's interesting is that we do know that at one point he was trying to develop them.

We also know that the reason why he was trying to develop those weapons of mass destruction was precisely because of the fact that he knew, like other Arab states in the Middle East knew, and like the Iranians know, that Israel does in fact have a massive nuclear arsenal which, according to one authoritative source I saw, is believed to be the fifth largest in the world.

So, if you're going to be consistent and raise questions about the nuclear arms race, you cannot just raise questions about Saddam Hussein or the North Koreans. If you look at the instability of the state of Israel with literally, at times, very contentious factions fighting against one another, with some people suggesting that ultimately civil war could erupt in Israel, I would say we

really should be concerned about Israel having nuclear weapons.

As I say, I brought these things out, and all the sources I cited on the subject were “mainstream” sources. It’s funny because I noticed in one of the failed attempts to critique my book somebody had posted on the Internet part of the review that you had on your website. And a person tried to respond to that by saying, “Oh, Piper—and presumably now Victor Thorn—are making it sound like this is some gigantic conspiracy with everybody tripping over one another.”

You know from having read my book—and as anyone who has read my book knows—the fact is that I pinpoint hardly more than five or ten key players who would’ve been involved in the planning, in my estimation.

Victor Thorn: Exactly.

Michael Collins Piper: It was a conspiracy of major proportions in the sense that they were killing the President of the United States, but in terms of the numbers of people who had to be involved, it didn’t have to be that many people.

Victor Thorn: You show there’s an inner core of planners, a secondary core, and then some people out on the periphery.

Michael Collins Piper: Right. To this day, a lot of people whose names have often been connected to the assassination—and this is strictly my opinion from what I can see—but there’s a lot of names of people who were involved in things in Dallas and in other cities that were kind of moving on the periphery. They didn’t have anything to do with the assassination, and probably had no idea that John F. Kennedy was going to be assassinated. They only did things on the instruction of others that ultimately implicated them in some way.

That’s why, for example, we have the story of Clay Shaw in New Orleans. To this day, I’m not convinced that Clay Shaw was actively involved in plotting the assassination of JFK; but on the other hand, there’s no question that he was moving in circles of the very people who were linked to the assassination. And that’s

why he got dragged into Jim Garrison's investigation.

Victor Thorn: Michael, there was one thing you brought up in this book that was so incredible that everybody should know about it. In 1950, there was something called the Tripartite Declaration that basically said that the United States would retaliate against any Middle Eastern country that attacked another one. While this lasted, there was peace, or at least relative peace in the Middle East. There was a balance. John Kennedy wanted to preserve this Tripartite Agreement, and it seems vitally important in our current day and age, especially since there isn't balance in the Middle East.

Michael Collins Piper: That's interesting because it brings up another subject. There's this new book—an extraordinary book in the sense that it's very detailed, but very disingenuous. The name of it is, I believe, *Support Any Friend*, and it very lamely attempts to portray John F. Kennedy as the father of the U.S.-Israel special relationship. What's interesting about this book is that when it comes to the point of discussing JFK's conflict with Israel over nuclear weapons, the author of this book—who frankly was funded by Israeli supported foundations and foundations funded here in the United States by supporters of Israel—the whole contention of the book is that JFK's struggle with Israel strengthened our relationship with Israel. That's wishful thinking at best. It's absolutely preposterous is what it comes down to.

I have to say frankly, I don't ever try to overestimate my own influence, but I really do have to think that this book was in some ways written as a response to *Final Judgment* because, increasingly, the word about my book has spread. I know in one case where a copy of the book was read by about twenty different doctors and medical technicians in a major western state city. What's happening is, the word about this conflict between JFK and Israel was spreading, and now they've come out with a book to say, "Well, actually, JFK and Israel were really very friendly." And that's not true!

Victor Thorn: After Kennedy was assassinated, LBJ came into office and he did two things that were horrendous for this country. First of all, you show in your book that almost immediately after LBJ took office, our aid to Israel skyrocketed and went through the roof. Also, a few days after he took office, he signed documents which escalated our involvement in Vietnam. Between Vietnam and our aid to Israel, LBJ was disastrous for this country.

Michael Collins Piper: It changed the whole course of events. It is a fact that the first major weapons sales from the United States to Israel came during the Kennedy administration. But the reason why Kennedy did that was because he was hoping to use that as a way to influence Israel away from building nuclear weapons. But even up until his last major press conference just a couple of weeks before he was shot, Kennedy was complaining about the fact that the Israeli Lobby in Washington had basically sabotaged efforts to build bridges to the Arab world, specifically to Egypt.

Kennedy did, in fact, sell some arms to Israel, the first arms sale that had ever taken place since the founding of the state of Israel. It was only after his assassination that the U.S. policy shifted so overwhelmingly, and it was also the shift in policy in Vietnam. The Kennedy assassination—more so than people realize—was a major turning point in U.S. policy, and to this day it is having reverberations that are impacting us now. Every time an American boy or girl comes back in a body bag from Iraq, it is a direct consequence of the Kennedy assassination.

Victor Thorn: I agree. You tell another story about how Israel started to construct a nuclear facility at Dimona, and they thought they were doing this beyond Kennedy's notice, but he was on top of it. He knew what they were doing. In fact, he knew so much that he actually challenged them and sent people over there to say they were going to inspect this facility. When I was reading this, it reminded me of what's going on today with "nuclear facilities" in the Middle East. They're moving them here and mov-

ing them there, and Israel did the same thing back then.

Michael Collins Piper: Yeah, what they did was, they built a “cover plant” so to speak. A “cover” nuclear plant around the main plant to try to distract the American arms inspectors, to convince them that this wasn’t for the purpose of building nuclear bombs, but for the purpose of distilling water to make the Middle East bloom. At that point it was such an intense thing; it was just two weeks before Kennedy was shot. There was a high-level meeting here in Washington between an Israeli representative and a U.S. representative and others, and they actually sidelined the nuclear issue because it was so sensitive and they had other things they needed to hammer out. So they just put it on the sideline. This is in the midst of President Kennedy’s very fierce letters to Israeli Prime Minister Ben Gurion, and then to his successor.

All the evidence indicates—although there have been some attempts to refute this—that JFK’s perceived intransigence on the issue of nuclear weapons was one of the reasons why Ben Gurion actually resigned as Prime Minister of Israel. This whole nuclear issue *vis a vis* Israel and the United States is something that you simply cannot get away from.

The other thing people have said to me, and I really wish I could get a serious critic who could demolish me, but they haven’t—the other criticism that comes up, and I almost laugh when I hear this, is “Oh, well, a little tiny country like Israel would never get involved in a U.S. presidential assassination because, what if they got caught?” I always say to them, “Whoever killed John F. Kennedy didn’t get caught because they knew that Lyndon Johnson and the Warren Commission were going to cover it up.”

And of course, without belaboring the point, in my book I show very convincingly that there were key people on the Warren Commission staff, not only members of the commission itself, who were in fact directly connected, or I should say, involved with Israel’s nuclear weapons program; and number two, people who were actually profiting from it. So it’s this hidden issue of the

nuclear problem that JFK had with Israel.

I've gotten more letters from people who have said, "When I first heard about your book, I thought it was crazy." Or they thought it was just propaganda, or it was silly. Then they actually read the book, and they turned around and wrote me apologetic letters saying, "You know something, I think you might be right." I've taken a great deal of satisfaction from that, and I just had a guy write me the other day telling me that he had been given a copy of my book by (as he put it) "a very important person" who said, "I think you need to read this book because this is pretty much what happened."

So, the word about my book is out there, and its thanks in part to people like you who dared to say nice things about it and spread the word. That's the only way. It comes back to what we've been talking about.

That's the real core of what I'm involved with and what you're involved with—bringing out the real news and alternative opinions and theories and ideas that are not otherwise expressed in the mainstream media, whether it's about the Kennedy assassination or U.S. foreign policy or economic policy or any other major issue. That's the whole thing. We do have freedom of speech in this country, and there are a lot of people who are trying to take it away. We know who those guilty parties are.

Victor Thorn: The thing that is going to surprise people when they read this book is they're going to think that it delves solely into the Kennedy assassination. What struck me is how historical it is, how much it goes beyond that to show political events and current events and things that have been happening up until today. Like you said about David Ben Gurion (and I'm paraphrasing here): he was so adamant about this—he said that the very survival of Israel depends upon them getting nuclear weapons.

Michael Collins Piper: Absolutely, absolutely. You're correct. That's right. That's another thing about *Final Judgment*. Although it hinges on the JFK assassination, it's far different from

a lot of other books on the subject because it places the whole assassination in a historical context and shows how the current events of that time were impacted by the assassination and how it relates to further developments in history ranging from things like the CIA's involvement in international drug trade to Vietnam to Central and South America. It's all interconnected, and as I say, the one thread that runs through it is the Israeli connection.

Even to this day when we have the Iran-Contra scandal, again the secret part of that was Israel. Israel was in up to its eyeballs in Iran-Contra. Even the U.S. deals, and of course the Iran-Contra deals, were directly connected to the CIA's drug trade involvement.

If you look in South America right now, the Israelis have been deeply connected with the drug trade. That literally ties into Iraq because of the Iran-Iraq war. The Israelis were playing both sides in that, and played a part in shifting the U.S. role in that war which resulted in the deaths of maybe, I don't know, millions of people. And that's the war between Iraq and Iran. This whole thing stems back to the events in Dallas.

Victor Thorn: Michael, you bring us back to a well-known figure: Meyer Lansky.

Michael Collins Piper: Meyer Lansky is a very interesting figure. We have all these wonderful films. *The Godfather* is a great film. I love that movie. I've seen it ten times. It presents a story of this Italian-American family, organized crime and so forth. "The Mafia, the Mafia." But if you look at the various figures who have most often been connected to the JFK assassination, and when they say the Mafia did it, you find Carlos Marcello in New Orleans, and Santo Trafficante in Tampa. I'm sorry to tell you, but these guys were all closely connected to the Mossad through Meyer Lansky.

Meyer Lansky is the guy who set up Carlos Marcello as the organized crime chief in New Orleans. In fact, Carlos Marcello was not even a part of the famed "Mafia" family that ran New

Orleans. Meyer Lansky came in there and ran the real Mafia boss out of business and put Carlos Marcello in charge. Santo Trafficante only became the power in charge of Tampa because he allied with Meyer Lansky. Meyer Lansky, in turn, was very heavily connected to the Israelis and to the Mossad. He also was involved in a lot of these CIA deals.

Since the fifth edition of *Final Judgment* came out, there's a fascinating new book called *Double Deal*. The co-author of the book is Sam Giancana, nephew of the famed Sam Giancana of Chicago. It turns out, according to Mr. Giancana and his co-author, who was a local police officer out in Chicago who was tied up with the Mafia, that the real power behind the throne of organized crime in Chicago from the 1930s well into the 1970s and 80s was a guy named Hyman Lerner, who in turn was a partner of Meyer Lansky, who in turn engaged a lot of business deals with the Mossad.

So even Sam Giancana—the famed Mafia kingpin of Chicago—had a revolving door of Mafia bosses and Italian-American crime figures in Chicago who would be in power for a few years, and then end up going to jail. But Hyman Lerner never went to jail.

As I say, you keep turning rocks over and you keep finding the Israeli connection. And I don't mean necessarily a Jewish connection. I'm talking about an Israeli connection here.

Victor Thorn: I wish we had all evening to speak about this subject; but on a different note, I know in the last few weeks and months you've been covering this horrendous new FCC ruling that just passed a few days ago. Give us your take on this, and what you see happening to this country now that it has passed.

Michael Collins Piper: This is a very complex thing, but basically what it is as we speak now is this: there are a handful of major international corporations that control vast numbers of newspapers, radio outlets, television stations and increasingly, various forms of communication. The numbers vary depending

upon a person's estimation, but basically you have a maximum of ten major corporations. This includes newspaper chains, communications companies like Disney, Viacom and so forth.

Over the years, there have been restrictions from rules put down by the Federal Communications Commission which limited the number of newspapers and/or television/radio stations that can be owned in any particular media market. However, just this past year, the Federal Communications Commission became chaired by Michael Powell, a Republican appointee and son of Secretary of State Colin Powell. And there's a Republican majority on the Commission at this time.

In any case, the FCC announced that they were going to amend the rules and allow major media corporations to buy more newspapers, radio and television stations in various media markets. The whole idea of a free press is that there are as many different voices as possible. However, these new rules that were proposed by the FCC were designed to let major corporations increase their influence.

Now, *AFP* did a front page story on this, and I want to tell you at the time, I'm fairly confident in saying that this was the first national publicity this story received. There were reports appearing in business sections of newspapers. Buried, I should say, in the business sections of newspapers.

But within the last couple of months, as word about this spread, various organizations—both “right-wing” and “left-wing”—and notice, I don't buy this theory of “right” versus “left”. I look at it as a matter of big corporations and special interest groups versus the people. In any case, there's a wide-ranging array of organizations, from the National Rifle Association to the National Organization for Women, along with lots of other people encouraging their followers and supporters to contact the FCC and Congress and say, “We don't want this to happen. We're against the media monopoly. We're against the further merger of these corporations.”

The upshot of it is that the FCC received almost 500,000 letters, emails, postcards—you name it—500,000. That's unprecedented. Well, despite all this, the FCC went ahead and passed these new regulations.

There was widespread popular opposition. The only people that supported it were major corporations. They keep telling us that we have a free press and we have democracy in the United States, and yet we have 500,000 people who care enough to do something about it and tell them “no”—and yet they went ahead and did it anyway.

Lisa Guliani: Michael, author Edward Aboud says that the majority of the electorate sits quietly un-represented in the mainstream media. What are your comments on that?

Michael Collins Piper: I think that's exactly true. I just did a piece for *American Free Press* in which I pointed out, relying on the work of Robert McChesny, who's a very good media author and professor of media communications at the University of Illinois—in any case, he points out that there is a perception that the mass media is liberal; but the media is far more conservative than many realize. In fact, you find a lot of what I call “approved conservative voices” such as Bill O'Reilly at FOX News, Rush Limbaugh, Mike Savage, G. Gordon Liddy—these “approved conservative voices” who are allowed to discuss certain issues.

But you won't hear them talking about the New World Order. You won't hear them talking about the Trilateral Commission or the Council on Foreign Relations. They never get into “conspiracy”. They won't talk about the Federal Reserve or things like this. So what we have is a corporate media that caters to the interests of a powerful elite moneyed few in this country. That's what it really comes down to.

Victor Thorn: In order to preserve the status quo.

Michael Collins Piper: Exactly.

Victor Thorn: That's the definition of conservatism, to preserve the status quo, so I say the media is very conservative in a

status quo sense.

Michael Collins Piper: That's right, and it's so funny because you find all these very famous, well-paid conservative commentators whose books are promoted by the media and who are promoted in the media, talking about how the liberals control the media. But if the liberals really controlled the media, these "approved" conservative voices wouldn't have any outreach or outlet.

It's kind of a little party. They sit around and they know that the big secret is the fact that it's an elite few who control the media, and they give us a steady diet of supposed debate between right-wing and left-wing that keeps us all focused—dare I say—either in left field or in right field. And we miss what's really going on in the center, so to speak.

Lisa Guliani: And what ends up happening is that the real news is not made available to the public.

Michael Collins Piper: No, it's not. And that's what really irks me about it. Somebody mentioned today that we had a piece in *AFP* this week that pointed out that there's been an awful lot of mainstream press about the tragedy surrounding this woman, Laci Peterson out in California. Forgive me, it's a very tragic thing, but I'll tell you something; here in Washington, D.C., we have people brutally murdered every other day, and that's just in Washington alone. People even get murdered in State College and it doesn't make the national news, and sometimes these other murders are very sensational.

So you have to ask yourself, why has the media turned this Laci Peterson affair into a national news story? What are they trying to do? Are they trying to distract us from real news that affects every American? This is what I'm afraid is happening. In fact, I know that's what's happening.

Victor Thorn: Just like the "Long Island Lolita," it has the right ingredients.

Michael Collins Piper: Exactly. It's a real offense to me as

a reasonably-educated person to be fed this non-news in the guise of it being news when there are real issues out there like the Federal Reserve, which affects our money system; or like the Gulf War. All these things affect our very day-to-day lives and survival and existence—not just as Americans, but as human beings on the face of this planet. And in light of this, we're focused on the Peterson case; or dare I say, the O.J. Simpson case.

Lisa Guliani: Or, as Edward Aboud says, “Vacuous team coverage of rain storms.”

Michael Collins Piper: Exactly!!! Seriously, that's what it's come down to, and this is why it is so important that there be an independent media. These big media monsters, this media monopoly—their excuse now for being able to buy up more and more media is that everybody has access to the Internet. But the part they leave out is that a lot of these major corporations—even today—when people are looking for news and information, there's people out in Peoria, Illinois or Lincoln, Nebraska who think they're really getting access to real news because they can get on the Internet and access *The New York Times* and *Washington Post*, which they couldn't get by subscription simply because it wasn't there. So really, you have the same information being said over and over again through a few different outlets.

Walter Cronkite, the great granddaddy of television news broadcasting (or maybe television news propaganda) was once asked, “How do you decide what's going to be on the evening news?” And he said, “It's always a safe bet that if you want to decide what the news will be, it's what is on the front page of *The New York Times*. So, if that's how Walter Cronkite took his lead; that meant that whoever decided what was on the front page of *The New York Times* was also effectively deciding what was on CBS Evening News that night.

Victor Thorn: Michael, what do you think this FCC ruling is going to lead to a few years down the line? How do you see the media marketplace in a few years?

Michael Collins Piper: At this point, there are more than a few members of Congress who have actually raised questions about this. The positive thing is that it appears they may actually try to use this as a campaign issue against George Bush. There are a few people in Congress who probably feel as seriously about it as you and I do. If we can make some hay out of it because the Democrats want to use it against George Bush, then I'm all in favor of doing that because it is important. We've got to keep focusing on it even if they don't amend these rules again, even if Congress doesn't take action to force the FCC to back off—which they can do—we still have to keep pounding away on it. That's something else important to mention, too.

Other countries such as New Zealand, Canada and Australia have had alternative and third political parties that have made the breakup of corporate media monopolies a major political issue. And these are political parties that are having an impact. If they can do it in other countries, in a country such as the United States where we do have so much communication, so much capacity to bring issues to the fore, then I think we need to do it here in the United States, too.

Lisa Guliani: The problem we're having is widening the circle, because the Internet news is so deliberately contained within the box, that to try to get it out to mainstream audiences is, well, practically impossible.

Michael Collins Piper: That's true, and that is one of the problems I have with the Internet; but on the other hand, the circle has widened considerably as a consequence of the Internet. Frankly, that's been a problem for publications such as *American Free Press*. I would never say we had a monopoly, but in a sense, a few years ago when I worked for *The Spotlight*—maybe 20 years ago—*The Spotlight* was a big newspaper, and then there were a lot of smaller, independent publications. Today, unfortunately, a lot of those smaller, independent publications have folded as a direct consequence of the Internet. Only because of a hardcore,

loyal following has a newspaper like *American Free Press* been able to survive.

Lisa Guliani: You have our utmost respect.

Michael Collins Piper: That's the whole thing. That's why *American Free Press* has been able to survive, only because of our supporters. I want to make another point to—not to belabor this—but a newspaper like *American Free Press* or your Internet publication; we rely on our supporters to literally fund our efforts because if we didn't have that support, we couldn't exist. In contrast, though, the major media in this country, the major newspapers, television, and radio stations have literally billions of dollars in funding from advertisers and major corporations.

And you know the irony of it is—most people don't know this—most Americans actually think that their daily newspaper is some sort of public service. Kind of like the telephone or radio or television. To most people, their impression of it is “free”. They turn it on and they get their news “free”. They might pay 10, 15 or 25 cents a day for their newspaper. They don't look at it as a cost, so they think that these people like Tom Brokaw are on there just being nice and bringing them the news they need to know. But in fact, Tom Brokaw is part of the Council on Foreign Relations crowd. Some powerful families have substantial financial interests in all three of the major networks. So, this is a media monopoly. *American Free Press* says the media is the enemy, and we believe it.

Lisa Guliani: We believe it too.

Victor Thorn: Michael, let's turn our attention to foreign affairs for a moment. Tell us what you think about this roadmap to peace.

Michael Collins Piper: The basic concept of the roadmap is something that I think everybody would like to support. However, you are finding critics from the so-called Christian Right here in the United States who are saying that George Bush, who they were praising just a few weeks ago for bombing the hell out of Iraq;

these same people are now saying that George Bush is going to hell because he's abandoning Israel.

Yet on the other hand, you find certain elements among the Palestinians who are saying that this roadmap is a sell-out of the Palestinians and they're not going to sit down. They refuse to be a part of this sell-out. Part of that problem is, and this comes from my own studies of the Mossad, you start looking at some of these Islamic fundamentalist groups and hard-line Palestinian groups and you find over the years that the Israelis actually funded Hamas at one point. Now, Hamas is their most bitter enemy.

The Israelis have thoroughly infiltrated a lot of these "terrorist" groups. They know what they're doing and they know when they're going to set off bombs. As much as we'd all like to see peace in the Middle East, I don't frankly think it's going to happen. I don't think it's anywhere down the road in the meantime because there are too many hard-line elements on both sides; and amazingly, you find the hard-line elements even in the Israeli right wing who are actually funding and encouraging the extremist elements among the Palestinians and other groups because it's to their benefit.

If they can make it look like the Palestinians don't want peace, then they can turn around and say they're not going to sit down and negotiate. Talk about a snake pit. It's a real tragedy because there are lots of innocent people on both sides—Muslims, Christians and Jews—among all the people involved here.

It's not really a religious issue, although the religion thing keeps coming up. Its real power politics; and you have to wonder if the real power people—the secret controllers of this world—if they don't want it to be this way. It's like they want this kind of trouble because it gives them the power to shape the world. I want there to be a Palestinian state, and if the Israelis are going to behave themselves, I want the Israelis to have their own state. But as things are right now, I just don't see it happening.

Victor Thorn: You're holding your breath about as much as

we are. How about Perle and Wolfowitz and Cheney and Rumsfeld? Do they want to keep the war machine rolling?

Michael Collins Piper: I'm afraid so. At first I thought they were gunning for Syria, but suddenly things seem to have evaporated there. Now all of a sudden, the focus seems to be on Iran. I heard the other day that Condoleezza Rice has quietly spread the word that there won't be any further military action during the first Bush administration. They don't want to take the chance of bungling things. I think it's probably because of the fact that they know that the whole Iraq thing is not settled just yet. There are still bodies coming home. The war is far from over, despite the grand appearance by our President on the aircraft carrier and all those wonderful pictures of smiling troops greeting him. It's not that cut-and-dried.

I guess my real concern—and this is a terrible thing—I was talking about this very subject with someone on the street tonight, and he asked me if there's going to be another terrorist attack. I said, "Well, you know, that may well be."

And when I say "they," I don't mean that handful of Arab terrorists operating out of caves in Afghanistan. I'm talking about the real people who sponsored that crime. I don't know who did it, but I don't believe that a handful of terrorists pulled it off.

Victor Thorn: Do you think the truth is ever going to come out about 9-11 on a large scale basis?

Michael Collins Piper: No. You know why it will never come out on a large scale basis? Bits and pieces of truth come out in their own little way here and there. The other day, one of the wives of one of the people who died on one of the airplanes on 9-11 testified before a special commission and she raised all these very serious questions. That was never reported in the mass media.

CHAPTER SIXTEEN

WING TV

The High Priests of War Interview

May 24, 2004

Victor Thorn: Today on WING TV we're proud to announce our first guest, someone we consider to be the best political writer in the country: Mr. Michael Collins Piper. He is the author of the recently released *The High Priests of War*, and also the seminal book on the JFK assassination, *Final Judgment*, which is now in its sixth printing. Michael also writes for the *American Free Press* newspaper. How are you doing, Michael?

Michael Collins Piper: I'm ready to roll here. A lot of things are happening in our world today, Victor and Lisa, so we've got to be more vigilant than ever, I'm afraid.

Lisa Guliani: Michael, we're thrilled to have you with us.

Michael Collins Piper: Yeah, it's good to be back on your show. I was on your radio show before, but this is a new experience for me with WING TV. It'll be a learning experience for us all, I guess.

Victor Thorn: You're our first guest, so we're starting off with a BANG! So, let's get right to it. To what extent is our foreign policy dictated by the interests of Israel?

Michael Collins Piper: I tell you; at one point in time I would have said it was a very strong influence. I would say now, based upon what I've observed and what I've learned in the process of writing *High Priests of War*, that a pro-Israel clique—this group that I've called the “high priests of war”—the neo-conservatives—they are in absolute control of the U.S. foreign policy-making apparatus. That doesn't mean that every single person in the Bush administration, for example, is part of this clique. But those who are members of the high priests of war, this clique of neo-conser-

vatives, they are the predominant factor in making policy.

Senator Fritz Hollings—a retired senator from South Carolina, said it himself—that the whole intent of the Iraq war was designed around President Bush’s policy to protect Israel. That’s precisely what it was all about. It had nothing to do with weapons of mass destruction. It had nothing to do with spreading democracy. It had nothing to do with freeing the people of Iraq from Saddam Hussein. It was simply part of a policy to protect Israel from Saddam Hussein.

That policy was laid out by these neo-conservatives, and its part of a much bigger policy they have in which they want to not only expand the borders of Israel from the Nile to the Euphrates (they call that Greater Israel), but it’s also a plot. Let’s call it what it is—a plot to use the military might of the United States—the men and women, the boys and girls who are over there dying, to prop up this whole secret neo-conservative agenda.

Lisa Guliani: I’m going to throw some names at you and I’d like you to address their role in this clique. First, Paul Wolfowitz.

Michael Collins Piper: Okay, Paul Wolfowitz is an assistant Secretary of Defense under Donald Rumsfeld, but if truth be told, Wolfowitz and his lieutenant, Douglas Feith, are probably the real powers behind the throne there at the Pentagon. Wolfowitz has been part of this neo-conservative cabal for the last 25 or 30 years, but obviously it wasn’t until the Iraq war and the circumstances surrounding it that people began to take notice of these neo-conservatives and their war agenda. Wolfowitz has been around for a long, long time.

Lisa Guliani: What about Richard Perle?

Michael Collins Piper: Richard Perle is probably the Grand Wizard of the neo-conservatives, if there ever was one. He’s certainly their leading behind-the-scenes geopolitical strategist. Above all, he has been the one most influential in military and defense circles. He’s a former assistant Secretary of Defense in the Reagan administration, but more recently he’s been “advising”

President Bush from his position as a member of the ostensibly independent Defense Policy Board. Richard Perle is tied up very heavily with Israel. He's been a registered lobbyist for the Israeli arms industry, and he was once investigated by the FBI—our own FBI—for espionage on behalf of Israel. But of course, he was never prosecuted. So, this is one of the men who has been manipulating policy inside, and from outside, the Bush administration.

Victor Thorn: Plus, their token “Prince of Darkness.”

Michael Collins Piper: They call Richard Perle the “Prince of Darkness.” That's pretty appropriate, actually.

Lisa Guliani: William Kristol.

Michael Collins Piper: William Kristol is editor of *The Weekly Standard*, which is published by Rupert Murdoch. *The Weekly Standard* is a weekly magazine voice of the neo-conservatives. I was saying to somebody the other day that the magazine is so Israel-centric that they can't even do a story about baseball without somehow mentioning Israel in some context. This magazine is a key to understanding the neo-conservative policy—they believe that every aspect of United States foreign policy, whether it deals directly with the Middle East or not, even if it's dealing with Iceland or Ireland or Indonesia; every policy that's carried out by the United States—they want it integrated so carefully with the interests of Israel. If the United States decides to do a friendly trade deal with Indonesia, that trade deal has to be scuttled if it should happen to interfere with the marketing of Israeli products in the United States. That is how intensely the neo-conservatives have correlated and integrated Israel into their own policy thinking.

You can get a good dose of that by reading William Kristol's magazine. He—along with his father Irving Kristol—have been key political coordinators for the neo-conservative movement in official Washington. They've got their hands tapped into a lot of foundations. Through that influence, they have been able to really control the distribution of foundation money to a lot of neo-con-

servative groups. So, if you're not favored by William Kristol and his father, Irving Kristol and the neo-conservatives, you're not going to get any money. What do they always say? Follow the money? Well, if you follow the money, it always leads back to the Kristol family.

Lisa Guliani: What about Henry Kissinger's role in all of this?

Michael Collins Piper: Henry Kissinger is a very interesting character in all of this because, traditionally, he was not considered part of the neo-conservative network. Yet since he left office as Secretary of State in 1977 and has gone into private business for himself, he has actually become immersed in the neo-conservative power network through his associations with William Kristol, Irving Kristol, and the neo-conservative network.

Ironically, many of these modern day neo-conservatives were outspoken critics of policies that Henry Kissinger had advocated back when he was Secretary of State in the Nixon and Ford administrations. But now Kissinger, in a certain sense, has come around and has joined the neo-conservatives, essentially, in advocating these very same policies. Now that he's out of office, he's able to do precisely what he wants without being governed by anybody else.

Victor Thorn: Always the opportunist.

Michael Collins Piper: Yes, he's very much an opportunist. Kissinger is generally not recognized as a neo-conservative per se because of his political origins, but he in fact has now come along to endorse the policies that they're advocating. So it's interesting. The leopard can change his spots.

Victor Thorn: When we talk about the neo-cons, it's easy to see how diabolical and deceitful they are, but there's still this element of intrigue around them, like they're a cult that's somehow received widespread notoriety. What can you say about this "intrigue" element that seems to follow them?

Michael Collins Piper: You know; it's very interesting you

bring that up because what you have to bear in mind is, I mentioned William Kristol's father, Irving Kristol. He has been the intellectual godfather of this neo-conservative movement, and what you have to remember is that although they're recognized today as conservatives, intellectually they began—and this is always very complex—but they began as Trotskyite Communists. They were followers of Leon Trotsky. Now, I'm going back to the 1930s here. Irving Kristol was a Trotskyite Communist.

They hated Josef Stalin, who was a nationalistic dictator of the Soviet Union; and they were followers of Leon Trotsky, who was expelled from Russia by Stalin. Trotsky had this idea of spreading world revolution. Stalin didn't go along with that. He wanted to, more or less, keep things contained within Russia and look at the world from a Russian nationalist perspective. That didn't make Stalin a nice guy, but the other guys were the internationalists—the Trotskyites.

These American followers of Trotsky—people such as Norman Podhoretz, Irving Kristol, and a handful of others—began to “evolve” intellectually. As time went by, they suddenly became what they themselves called the neo-conservatives. In other words, they're just a new brand of old-style Trotskyism.

Victor Thorn: They were adherents of Henry “Scoop” Jackson, and then when the Democrats didn't pay as much heed to Israel, that's when the break occurred.

Michael Collins Piper: Yeah, this is what's kind of interesting. When most people think back to 1972, they remember Nixon versus McGovern, and everybody has a general perception that the Jewish community is very liberal and automatically votes for Democratic candidates. Well, actually what happened in 1972 was that the hard-line Jewish supporters of Israel, who are basically what you might call the backbone of the neo-conservatives; they broke with McGovern, and McGovern didn't get a lot of money from sources that would normally give to the Democratic Party.

That's when the neo-conservative group, the leaders of what

is known as the neo-conservatives today, began to move out of the Democratic Party and into the Republican Party. By about 1980, they were all pretty much firmly backing Ronald Reagan. This is why we had the massive arms build-up under Ronald Reagan in the 1980s. The neo-conservatives were in there saying, “Oh, the Soviet Union is preparing to engage in all these great military ventures around the world and we need a massive arms buildup, and only if we keep building up arms can we support the state of Israel, which is our grand ally in the war against communism.”

Well, of course we spent billions and billions of dollars building up our defenses, while at the same time leaving a lot of things go here at home; and it turned out the Soviet Union fell apart anyway. And it had nothing to do with our arms buildup. The Soviet Union fell apart just as people predicted it would.

But what’s interesting is, again the neo-conservatives lied to us. They told us the CIA was underestimating Soviet strength, and therefore we needed this massive arms buildup. The neo-conservatives LIED. They lied, they lied, they lied ... just like they lied about Saddam Hussein. Now, there’s an old saying: Fool me once, shame on you. Fool me twice, shame on me.

Victor Thorn: Well, in this country, we have a lot of “shame on me” now.

Michael Collins Piper: Yeah, we’ve gotten fooled again because these neo-conservatives were the liars who brought us the final days of the massive arms buildup in the Cold War, an arms buildup that was unnecessary and which cost the American economy a great deal; and also now they’ve brought us the Iraq war in which we are losing people every day now. Of course, President Bush declared victory a year ago, but it doesn’t look like a victory to me.

Lisa Guliani: Considering that the neo-conservatives began as a small, not-so-powerful group, how did this clique come into such power within our government?

Michael Collins Piper: That’s a very interesting point, and

I think it all comes down to the media. A good example of it is this guy William Kristol. Although he's only the publisher of a relatively small-circulation magazine, that magazine is considered "must-reading" within Republican policy circles. Every smart young Republican carries a copy of *The Weekly Standard* in his briefcase now.

Victor Thorn: You probably see it everywhere in Washington, don't you?

Michael Collins Piper: Yeah, and it's actually a rather boring magazine, to tell you the truth. Aside from that, it is influential. In addition to that—and you'll notice this yourself—you cannot turn on television or open a national newspaper account of some major political event without finding William Kristol quoted or interviewed. He's ubiquitous in the press. He and other neo-conservatives have this happy talent for being selected to be quoted on television. Not because they're necessarily promoting themselves, which they are, but they also have the willing and friendly support of the American press.

In other words, there are maybe ten or fifteen other equally quotable people, or even more quotable people, so to speak—but the press always goes to William Kristol. Or they go to Richard Perle.

These are the guys who coordinated this; and then of course with all the money I mentioned earlier through their foundations, they have been able to have a lot of influence in Republican policy-making circles in Washington by getting their people, their allies, placed in key places and moving up through the ranks. As a consequence of that, as each of those new people begins to build their own individual power network, it's always connected back to the Kristol family.

Victor Thorn: One of the strengths of your book is how you show the neo-cons as being part of this much larger Globalist movement, like the Bilderbergs, the CFR, and the Royal Institute of International Affairs; and you show that they're controlled, or

that they're part of this bigger picture.

Michael Collins Piper: Yeah, this is something that's easy to point your finger at. What a lot of people do is, they'll write about foreign policy and say, "The Council on Foreign Relations is behind it," or they'll say, "The Bilderberg group is behind it," or they'll say, "The Zionist lobby is behind it." The fact is, all of these groups are interconnected and overlapping in many ways, and you cannot get away from the Council on Foreign Relations without looking at the Rothschild family in Europe, who are major patrons of Israel.

Although the CFR is an American organization which was set up with support from the Rockefeller family and some other New York families, the fact is the Council on Foreign Relations is like the poor American cousin of the Royal Institute of International Affairs, which is funded in Europe—in London—by the Rothschild family. Again, it's all part of a network. These groups all operate in tandem. There are differences of opinion inside these groups, like even with the Bilderberg group. A lot of the European Bilderberg group people did not want to see the United States go into Iraq. You see the split where France and Germany were very adamantly opposed to U.S. involvement in Iraq.

So, even within the higher circles there are differences of opinion, and a lot of it does in fact have to do with the split between the supporters of Israel and those who are just out for money and power and are not ideologically driven by a concern for Israel. That is the hallmark of the neo-conservative movement.

But, this neo-conservative hard-line network that we're talking about is very heavily tied up with the Likud group of Ariel Sharon and Israel, and they're the mirror-image of hard-line Islamic fundamentalists. These happen to be hard-line Jewish fundamentalists and they're allied with hard-line Christian fundamentalists in the United States. It's a strange dichotomy.

Lisa Guliani: Has the rest of our Congress and politicians been rendered powerless because of the power of this clique?

And what do you see as the future of America? People ask us all the time, what can be done to fight them?

Michael Collins Piper: Oh boy, that's probably going to be the toughest question. As far as the rest of Congress is concerned, I think it's very telling that in the last several years one of the most outspoken critics of Israel and U.S. policy in this regard was Jim Traficant. He's now sitting in a federal prison in New York State, and was recently denied his appeal for a new trial. So he's going to be spending seven years in jail. Of course, Fritz Hollings came out here the other day railing against Israeli influence in Washington, but he's retiring. He's 84-85 years old and retiring from the Senate.

Victor Thorn: And Congresswoman Cynthia McKinney...

Michael Collins Piper: Yeah, Cynthia McKinney was driven out of office down in Georgia, but she made a comeback. There are a few bright spots in Congress on various issues, but on the whole, Congress is impotent. The money that flows there from the Israeli Lobby is very powerful. But even more powerful is the media. That's what you always have to keep in mind because any member of Congress who steps out of line is sure to be hit with a barrage of negative publicity in the media. The media can make you, and the media can break you. What the immediate future holds doesn't look good as far as the choice between Bush and Kerry, because Kerry is only promising to manage the war a little better.

Victor Thorn: Hand it over to the UN...

Michael Collins Piper: Yeah, and I wouldn't even count on that. Kerry is very much a part of the foreign policy elite. Don't forget he's Skull & Bones along with George W. Bush. So, this is one of the non-choices we have. I'm personally going to vote for Ralph Nader if he's on the ballot.

Lisa Guliani: What can we do, though—anything?

Michael Collins Piper: You know; that's a good question. I guess we just have to keep doing what we're doing until a nation-

al political movement coalesces that has a real chance to come in and really start winning elections. But running in local elections, everybody looks at running a presidential candidate every four years. People really need to do things in their local community to stir up things and to get public discussion of events and so forth. There's still an opportunity there.

Most people don't have a national forum, but they do have contacts in their local community. And spreading the word in any way possible is, at this point, the best thing. Thanks to the Internet and the new technology we have, the world is becoming a much smaller place, and we probably have a better chance.

Let's put it this way. Even though the situation in the United States is a lot worse in the last 25 years, we still have more immediate communication than we did 25 years ago, and that gives us new opportunities to reach out to other people, to like-minded people and to build coalitions and to challenge the powers-that-be.

Right now, I suppose the immediate thing I'd like to see is to get rid of George Bush and the neo-conservatives, but I'm not sure John Kerry would provide us anything better.

Victor Thorn: John McCain's been in the news a lot lately, and when we did a video about the *U.S.S Liberty*, we saw that his (McCain's) father had some involvement with covering up what happened to the *U.S.S Liberty* in 1967. In your book, you quote Senator John McCain from Arizona as saying, "The survival of Israel is one of this country's most important moral commitments." Doesn't that sum it all up?

Michael Collins Piper: Yeah, that's right. John McCain ... I could spend an hour talking about John McCain, but suffice it to say that he has some very strange connections in his family background ... and his father-in-law ... John McCain is one of these politicians who has frankly made a lot of money by being connected in the right places, and some of those connections go right back to the people I've documented in *Final Judgment* that were

involved in the Kennedy assassination.

Lisa Guliani: Rather than say the survival of America is one of our strongest moral commitments, McCain says it's Israel.

Michael Collins Piper: Yeah, I never could quite "get" that. You know, I always say as an American, I don't hear people running around saying the survival of Iceland or the survival of Indonesia or the survival of Ireland are integral to American security. I just don't get it. It's an ideological thing—it's almost cult-like. Zionism has a certain cult-like appeal to a small group of people who happen to have a lot of money and influence.

Some of the best critics of Israel I know are Jewish. They don't even believe under the Jewish faith that the state of Israel should exist. That's from a purist theological point of view. But yet you have a handful of people like John McCain who are in the thrall of Zionist money and power and they have lent their names and prestige and reputations to this whole cause. And we're seeing the results of it right now in the Middle East every time a body bag comes back with an American in it.

CHAPTER SEVENTEEN

WING TV

American Free Press Interview

October 29, 2004

Victor Thorn: Michael, welcome to WING TV.

Michael Collins Piper: It's always good to be on ... can't find a better place to be on the Internet.

Victor Thorn: I was just thinking today that you were the first guest we ever had on WING TV.

Michael Collins Piper: I had forgotten about that, but you're absolutely right. I remember you telling me how you were setting up this program. You've certainly come a long way since then. And you know, I just did a radio show yesterday and it was on a small talk station out west. It's a very well established independent AM station, but I told the people that I don't think they realize how much of the nation's media is in the hands of a select few, this media monopoly that we always write about at *American Free Press*. So it's good that there are other independent voices out there—independent media resources that people can take advantage of. WING TV is one of them.

Victor Thorn: *American Free Press* covers the corporate media so well and points out what they're *not* covering. Michael, I'd like to start off today by asking you this question: If a person didn't read *Final Judgment*, what's one thing that they could take away from this book about the Kennedy assassination that no other book or the mainstream media has covered?

Michael Collins Piper: I suppose it's the fact that there was a secret war between John F. Kennedy and Israel. JFK was trying to stop Israel from building nuclear weapons of mass destruction. I guess the bottom line is: if JFK had not been killed, Israel would've probably never gotten nuclear weapons, and as a conse-

quence of that Iraq would've never tried to build nuclear weapons and we wouldn't have had the Iraq war we're facing today.

Lisa Guliani: With the first release of *Final Judgment*, a great storm of controversy erupted, particularly from certain pressure groups, and they tried to have your book banned. Why?

Michael Collins Piper: Well, you're not really allowed to say anything critical about Israel, or at least in certain degrees; certainly not an idea suggesting that Israel was involved in the Kennedy assassination. It's a very extreme criticism. Not extreme in that it's not a possibility, but it's considered beyond the pale as far as what you are, and are not, allowed to say about Israel. It's not just Israel, but it's so many other controversial areas in American life where there are limits on what you're allowed to say. But Israel just happens to be perhaps the most sensitive of them all.

Lisa Guliani: Your thesis revolves around the fact that the Mossad, the CIA, and organized crime played key roles in the JFK assassination; and it paved the way for Zionist influence in America, didn't it?

Michael Collins Piper: That's exactly right. That's pretty much what happened as a consequence of JFK's assassination. The Israeli lobby achieved a stronger influence in Washington than it ever had before, and U.S.-Middle East policy did a 180 degree turn-about after the death of JFK. There is, though, still some debate among people who believe in a conspiracy surrounding the JFK assassination. There are those who still debate precisely what JFK's intentions were toward Vietnam, for example.

But the fact is, as far as Middle East policy is concerned, there was a 180 degree turnabout upon JFK's death. Even though that was in 1963, we are still feeling the impact of this sudden turnabout and the immense growth in power of the Israeli lobby because the entire Middle East today, the entire Arab Middle East, wouldn't be harboring desires of having nuclear weapons—let alone harboring nuclear weapons—if it weren't for the fact that

for years Israel has had this secret stash of weapons of mass destruction and won't admit to it.

Victor Thorn: I've written a series of articles for WING TV about a guy named John Lehman who's a member of what we call the 9-11 Whitewash Committee. It was originally called the 9-11 Independent Commission; but when you look into this guy, you see that he was one of the signatories on the PNAC letters. He's also a member of "Team B," along with the CPD, which is the Committee for the Present Danger. He also has associations with Wolfowitz and Perle and Feith. In today's article, I directed people to your book, *The High Priests of War*. So tell everyone out there about "Team B," the PNAC, and all these other groups that John Lehman is involved with.

Michael Collins Piper: I think the primary bottom line and signature of all these groups is that they are very much part and parcel at a very high level of the policy-making of the Israeli lobby within the national security establishment in the United States, at least here in Washington. Lehman has been involved in arms deals with Israel, he's held some obviously high positions, and he does have all these connections that you mentioned. He is part of this very small, tightly knit group of neo-conservatives who are pretty much dictating policy—at least right now—inside the Bush administration. For many years, they've been trying to bend U.S. policy in the way that they've succeeded in doing now. He was part of this "Team B" group. These are people who, as early as the 1970s, were involved in a complicated program that was set up when the CIA was being criticized for underestimating Soviet military and imperial intentions. The people who were making these criticisms were largely the supporters of Israel who had determined that the best way to get military aid and support to Israel was to say that Israel was a key element of the U.S. defense against Soviet expansionism.

Victor Thorn: That's reminiscent of Iraq and the WMDs, isn't it?

Michael Collins Piper: Exactly. So they said, we can't trust the CIA, so we're going to set up an alternative institution to analyze the CIA's analyses—essentially analyzing the analyzers. This "Team B" group that Perle, his friend Lehman, and all these other people were associated with was like an effort to counter the work of the CIA and say, "The CIA is wrong and we're right". This early "Team B" experiment solidified relationships between many of these neo-conservatives who have later come to play such a critical role in our world today. Personally, John Lehman's a good example. He's one of the last people who should have ever been appointed to the 9-11 Commission precisely because of his close ties with the neo-conservatives in Israel.

Lisa Guliani: We've seen how U.S. foreign policy favors Israel with regard to the Middle East, and we've seen it with central Asia, but it also applies to other European countries and nations too, doesn't it?

Michael Collins Piper: Yes, that's what's so strange about it. As you know, I just took a trip to Malaysia, and one of the props I had in my hand was a copy of *The Journal of International Security Affairs*, which is published by the Jewish Institute for National Security Affairs (JINSA). They had a special entitled *Asia Now* in which their whole analysis was: U.S. policy towards Asia.

But in fact, these neo-conservatives have a very wide-ranging worldview, and whether its policy towards Europe or Asia, Africa, South America, you name it—they are constantly concerned with one thing and one thing alone—what is best for Israel.

So if the United States is concluding a trade deal with the nation of Colombia, for example, the Israeli advocates within these neo-conservative circles are going to look at that trade deal and say, well listen, if you're going to be importing olives from Colombia, will that effect U.S. trade importation of olives from the state of Israel? I don't even know if they have olives in Colombia; that was just an example.

But something as mundane as that involves all these analysts who sit around and look at U.S. policies and try to decide if it's good for Israel. Secondly, the question comes up—maybe even on a third level—is it good for the United States?

Victor Thorn: A by-product.

Michael Collins Piper: Yeah, that's right.

Victor Thorn: Today I was speaking with a woman from Iran who's an electrical engineer and we had about 25 minutes to chat. We started getting into a few things, and she said that there might be CIA elements right now in the Iranian government that are trying to bring about further war in the Middle East. After hearing that, I referred to your book today where you wrote, "Is the Arab world, along with the rest of mankind, simply a pawn in a much larger game in which the neo-conservatives are only tools themselves?" And it all seemed to fit together.

Michael Collins Piper: Yeah, that's really scary because over the years, although the people of the United States were really reveling in the collapse of Saddam Hussein, my understanding—without too much detail—is the reason why Saddam's military and government collapsed so quickly during this last war was because the United States bribed some of his key people to come over and basically get his military to stand-down. Not to belittle the work of the U.S. troops who were over there, but sometimes there are behind-the-scenes elements at work, and I'm fearful that this could very well be the situation in Iran as well.

I have heard similar things over the years that there are certain factions within the Iranian government that do have "outside connections" so to speak. They may well not be working in the best interests of their own country. It may be, in fact, in the best interests of the United States for a change of government there.

On the other hand, if there's a greater agenda at work such as what I've talked about in *The High Priests of War*, if the agenda is war for the sake of war, for the sake of reshaping the world in the design of these grand chess players, I don't know if that's in

America's best interests, or Iran's best interests either.

But yes, the bottom line is: the CIA and other intelligence agencies have people inside governments, people being bribed, people being blackmailed, you name it. So what you see isn't always what you get.

Lisa Guliani: Regarding depleted uranium and our troops, the *American Free Press* has reported that eight of twenty men who served in one unit in the 2003 Iraq military offensive now have cancerous malignancies. That's 40% of the soldiers in that one unit that got cancerous malignancies in 16 months. How are they hiding this information about depleted uranium from our troops, and do you think this is the definitive cause of Gulf War syndrome?

Michael Collins Piper: I was just looking at some of these articles we've done, and I'm thinking back to the whole Gulf War Syndrome as it was called after the first U.S. invasion of Iraq. It was so apparent from the very beginning that there were some serious problems developing among Gulf War veterans, yet the United States government adamantly dismissed the idea that there was anything happening. Those who were discussing the subject were, of course, you've heard it before—"conspiracy theorists," "fear-mongers," and "don't pay attention to these people because they're just troublemakers." And yet, we've seen the consequences of that.

Ten years have gone by since that first invasion of Iraq ... well over ten years now ... and thanks to the work of Christopher Bollyn and the *American Free Press* and a lot of other independent researchers around the country and around the world, we are discovering a lot more about this depleted uranium, and I think it's pretty obvious that there's something wrong there.

How long is it going to take though? Is it going to take another ten years before the rest of the world catches up to what's going on? How many more cancer cases do we have to get?

Lisa Guliani: Do you think Henry Kissinger is the one who

devised using the depleted uranium? It's wiping out genetic codes and future populations of Arabs and Muslims, and our soldiers are carrying this radioactive dust all around the world and contaminating others.

Michael Collins Piper: That's interesting because a few years ago, I think it was the *London Sunday Times*, carried a report that the Israelis were working on genetic weapons that would specifically target people with Arabic genes. Now, I mentioned this in a speech that I gave to the Arab League in the Middle East, and I was attacked for that here in the United States by the Anti-Defamation League. They said I *claimed* that the Israelis were working on such a bomb. In other words, suggesting that this was something I just spun out of the whole cloth, yet in fact this, as I say, was reported by, I believe, *The London Times* several years ago. So, this could very well be an outgrowth of that.

There is quite a possibility that there have been some sort of genetic treatments, and it's inevitable that a lot of people, whatever the cause, are going to be affected by this. We know it now. There's no doubt about it. The consequences of it are so immense.

Although it has been mentioned in some mainstream press, it's not being given the publicity and attention it deserves because of the magnitude of what it represents. I mean, how many soldiers do you think—even the bravest American soldier—how many of them do you think would really be prepared to fight in a war where they can suffer consequences without even being wounded by enemy fire? It's amazing.

Lisa Guliani: It's a death sentence.

Victor Thorn: Michael, let's veer for a second and get into the tabloid element of the mainstream media. It was revealed today that Bill O'Reilly settled out of court with the female producer from FOX News who had filed a lawsuit against him. According to news reports, the settlement was anywhere from 2-10 million dollars. In addition, the woman was said to accept no blame for this incident, and neither did O'Reilly. What do you

think about this whole debacle?

Michael Collins Piper: Oh, they settled out of court—very, very interesting. Well, the fact that someone settles out of court doesn't necessarily mean they're guilty one way or the other. Sometimes it's easier financially and emotionally to do something like that. But I guess what I would have to say about Bill O'Reilly and a lot of these people—and they're all part of the neo-conservative network. You know, Bill O'Reilly works for FOX.

I've always found it kind of funny—and I'm not a prude by any means, believe me—but these neo-conservatives are constantly talking about family values and how we need to clean up television. Yet they like FOX News and all the commentators on FOX. But I guarantee you, folks, if you turn on FOX television you're going to find more of the, how shall we say, slimier elements of programming.

Victor Thorn: And then you have Dick Morris with his toe-sucking.

Michael Collins Piper: Yeah, this is what I'm saying. I'll tell you what; there's a little bit of hypocrisy right there. Even Pat Robertson, as I recall, had some broadcasting deals with FOX television. Here's Pat Robertson who's spent the last 40 years talking about cleaning up television, and there's nothing wrong with that. As I said, I'm not a prude. But on the other hand, there's a lot of stuff on TV that's pretty slimy, for want of a better word. And I'd rather not see it on television.

Lisa Guliani: We heard him (Bill O'Reilly) lie today on the radio. He said, "There is no controlling authority over the media." But do you know what's curious? He also has this propensity lately to try and separate himself from the mainstream media.

Michael Collins Piper: That's funny. He's trying to pretend that he's something different, and yet he's just another part of their stable of well-trained horses that come out and perform. He's like a dancing horse or a dancing bear. That's all he is. He's got a particular schtick, a particular agenda, and this is what all of these dancing bears and horses, these trained monkeys, do who perform for the mainstream media "news outlets."

Victor Thorn: Michael, in this very long election season, I think

the most refreshing moment came when Ralph Nader started talking about the Israeli puppet masters that go into the White House ... and they're the same puppet masters who go into the halls of Congress ... and they walk out and take back to Israel whatever they want. Actually, that quote was right in the centerfold of the *American Free Press* this week. What do you think the fallout will be for Ralph Nader with this very dangerous quote that he gave?

Michael Collins Piper: I'll tell you what. As far as Ralph Nader is concerned, I think he definitively earned himself a very high rank on the "to be watched" list of the Israeli lobby and other people who make it their business to control freedom of expression in this country, because Nader is probably the first "mainstream" politician, if you can call him that; I guess he's mainstream in the sense that he's been kind of a mainstream celebrity figure for many years. He's the first one to ever really use that kind of terminology. There have been others who've talked about the Israeli lobby being powerful in Washington, but to go so far as to use the term "puppet masters," that really puts a perspective on the whole debate about the power of the Israeli lobby. It puts it in a more stark perspective than anyone has ever presented it before. Unfortunately, he's largely correct. I wish I could say he was exaggerating.

Lisa Guliani: Earlier this year you wrote about HR 3077, the anti-hate speech legislation which directly attacks the First Amendment, along with the Zionist lobby's influence with this bill and how they pushed it through the House. Talk a little bit about that.

Michael Collins Piper: That's also really interesting, because if you read the legislation itself, it's quite innocuous. I shouldn't say it's innocuous—it's innocuously worded. It's very dry legislative language that the average person taking it out of context would not understand. But what this legislation precisely does is set up a mechanism whereby the federal government can effectively silence dissidents of Israel on American campuses, whether they're college professors or instructors, and implicitly it would have far-reaching ramifications for the entire university system itself. It would set up an appointed tribunal that would look at the manner in which Middle Eastern studies are being taught on American campuses. The intent of it—obviously

based upon who's supporting the legislation (the Israeli lobby)—was to stop American college professors from being critical of Israel.

Victor Thorn: Before we go, share with us your thoughts on what the future holds for the New World Order and America?

Michael Collins Piper: As far as the future of this New World Order, I think a lot of that has yet to be determined by the election, although generally, I don't think elections make a very big difference in the long run. I think this election may have a more significant difference than others, precisely because of the presence of these neo-conservative high priests of war in the Bush camp. If they get another four years, they could do an immense amount of damage of a type that might not be done if John Kerry and his "gang" get in. If you ask me that question on Tuesday after the election, I think I could give you a more definitive answer.

I just want to say, though, that there are—thanks to WING TV and *American Free Press* and a lot of other independent voices on the Internet, radio, and in print—there are so many rising voices of dissent, it's not going to be so simple for the New World Order gang to bring us around to where they want us. They keep pushing, and they have a lot of power and influence, but we can push back. That's what we're doing right here today.

CHAPTER EIGHTEEN

WING TV

The New Jerusalem Interview

June 17, 2005

Victor Thorn: I got *The New Jerusalem: Zionist Power in America* a few weeks ago and it's phenomenal. We couldn't wait to be here with you today. So to start off, I think the most vital point that every person in this country needs to know is found right on page one of the introduction of this book, where you say that the two great tragedies of this still young century are 9-11, of course, and also the American invasion of Iraq, which is a direct consequence of U.S. policy in the Middle East which is dictated by the Israeli lobby. My first question is: tell us why it's so vitally important to understand this fundamental notion.

Michael Collins Piper: It's very simple, Victor. As I point out in the book, here we are involved in this bloody, insane, nonsensical war in Iraq that is only making the United States enemies around the world, and we had 3,000 American victims of a terrorist tragedy that has been attributed to Middle Eastern terrorists. Now frankly, I have very serious questions about who ultimately was responsible for 9-11, but just for the sake of argument, let's accept the president's claim that we were attacked by angry Muslims from the Middle East.

In my lifetime, there have been two things that I have desperately fought against since I was old enough to think politically. Number one: U.S. involvement in a war, particularly in the Middle East. I saw what happened in Vietnam, and I see no reason for anybody ever again to have to be subjected to the brutality of war. It affected my own brother. He was a Vietnam veteran, he never completely got over Vietnam, and his early death was a direct consequence of his Vietnam experience.

The other thing that I was very concerned about was terrorist attacks in the United States; and lo and behold, we finally had one. And it's all because of, I'm sorry to say, Israel. It has nothing to do with oil. It's all about Israel, and it's an obvious fact that we have a very powerful lobby in this country, whether we want to call it the Israeli lobby or pro-Israeli lobby or the Jewish lobby—whatever you want to call it—the fact is that it exists. It's not a conspiracy theory.

Some people say that's a conspiracy theory or an old wives' tale based upon the *Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion*, which they say is a forgery. It's not. It's not a wives' tale.

We have this powerful Israeli lobby, and the people who finance them are a very wealthy, highly influential group of people who happen to be Jewish. They've accumulated this power and wealth, and we are now in a position where we effectively have an elite few who can dictate our foreign policy. It's a foreign policy that's trying to advance the interests of another country! I find that extraordinary.

Lisa Guliani: Michael, we recently attended the *OKC Bombing 10 Year Anniversary Day of Truth* in Oklahoma City, along with your colleague from *American Free Press*, Pat Shannan. In your book, you point out how dozens of well-known public figures from all walks of life have been labeled anti-Semitic. Well, subsequent to our return from Oklahoma City, we've since discovered that the ADL has listed that event, the Day of Truth, on their website's "hate list". Would you explain how the ADL acts as Thought Police for the Zionist elite in America?

Michael Collins Piper: That's a very interesting question; and a question that's posed in a very revealing context. I was aware that the ADL had, in fact, labeled that meeting a "hate" or "extremist" type event, and I find that extraordinary in and of itself because I don't think there was anybody at that event with the intent to defame any group of people, and that's what the Anti-Defamation League claims it was trying to prevent—group defamation.

The event was just a group of sincere people who were trying to find out who murdered all of those people in Oklahoma City, and obviously we know that the official government story doesn't hold up. So I find it very interesting that the Anti-Defamation League would position itself effectively as a defender of the government.

Actually, the Anti-Defamation League has an interesting history. It started off—and I'm sorry to say this—because there were so many Jewish people involved in criminal activity in New York City back in the late 19th century. People started making unkind remarks about Jews, and that's why they started the Anti-Defamation League, to counteract that because there were so many complaints by public officials and law enforcement.

Well, over the years, the Anti-Defamation League evolved into a very effective conduit and propaganda arm for the state of Israel after it was established. The ADL, of course, spies—literally spies—on thousands and thousands of Americans. Even the FBI and the San Francisco Police Department conducted an extensive investigation into the ADL's spying activities and discovered they had files on thousands of Americans. And not just people on the right wing, but a lot of folks who considered themselves liberals thought the ADL was just out there spying on those evil Klansmen and Nazis, and it turned out they were spying on all sorts of people of all political stripes.

Basically, the ADL is a Thought Police. It is designed to prevent anyone from saying anything critical about the state of Israel, unless it's approved by the ADL in advance. Anyone who even dares to mention the fact that the Israelis have immense power in this country is considered anti-Semitic. So that's what the ADL is. It is a Thought Police.

Victor Thorn: In your book, *Final Judgment*, you reveal that there was obviously tension between John Kennedy and David Ben Gurion, and everybody knows how Richard Nixon felt about the Jews. But in your new book, you also bring up revelations about Harry Truman, Gerald Ford, Jimmy Carter, and even

James Baker on how they felt about the Jewish Lobby. Tell us a little bit about that.

Michael Collins Piper: I can tell you one thing—all of those people you’ve mentioned have been quoted in mainstream news sources as using some pretty foul language which I wouldn’t want to say on your show in reference to the power of the Jewish people in America *vis-a-vis* their influence, particularly on U.S. foreign policy. Harry Truman—they discovered his private diaries—and this is the guy who’s basically a hero of the Jewish people for his role in helping bring about the founding of the state of Israel. Of course, he recognized the state of Israel and he’s always been a hero. But in his private diary, which was cited in *The Washington Post*, I’m going to read this quote: This is what Harry Truman, former President of the United States, said in his diary entry of July 21, 1947:

“The Jews have no sense of proportion nor do they have any judgment in world affairs. The Jews, I find, are very, very selfish. They care not how many Estonians, Latvians, Finns, Poles, Yugoslavs or Greeks get murdered or mistreated as displaced persons as long as the Jews get special treatment. Yet, when they, the Jews that is, have power—physical, financial or political—neither Hitler nor Stalin has anything on them for cruelty or mistreatment to the underdog.”

Now, that’s a pretty strong statement. It’s certainly stronger than anything I have ever said, or a lot of people have ever said. But I want to tell you something. Based upon my study of history—and I’m standing in my library—just in this room alone, I have about 6,000 books. I’m pretty well read. I would have to say that based upon my reading, what Harry Truman said is exactly true. This is what we’re finding now.

We are finding that the ruling Jewish elites in America—and I’m not talking about every Jewish person now—I’m talking about

these big powerful Jewish elites with literally billions of dollars in their control who are using that influence because of their desire to advance the state of Israel. These people do not care how many American kids get butchered in Iraq. They do not care. This is of absolutely no concern to them. They are fully ready to get us into a war against Iran, against Syria, and I predict ultimately they're going to try to figure out a way to invade Saudi Arabia. And that's probably just the beginning.

These people are truly bloodthirsty—maybe bloodthirsty is not the word. It's just that they don't care. They know that American kids will be cannon fodder, and their kids won't be.

Lisa Guliani: You've quoted Benjamin Ginsberg's book, *The Fatal Embrace*, and in it he says that 75% of America's foreign aid budget is dedicated to Israel's security interests. So, Michael, do you think this figure would be shocking to most Americans?

Michael Collins Piper: You know; that's funny ... that's an interesting point. The quick answer to that is YES, because a lot of people just don't like foreign aid—period. And those who do like foreign aid think of it as helping the starving kids in Ethiopia. They have these heartfelt, fond, very sentimental ideas. We're a nice, rich, powerful country here in the United States and we give our money to starving people. Well, that isn't who we give the money to.

Most of our foreign aid goes to Israel, and a substantial portion goes to Egypt to pay Egypt to be nice to Israel. The people of Israel, as I understand it, have one of the highest per capita levels of income *vis a vis* the rest of the world. And it's precisely because of the United States propping up the state of Israel. That's a very, very wealthy little country only because the United States props it up.

You know all about the wonders of Israeli technology and Israeli science and Israeli this and Israeli that. It only exists because the United States puts the money in there. So, any other country of the same size could accomplish the same things with

the United States propping it up. It's essentially a beggar state. It could not exist without the United States, yet the United States' entire foreign policy at this time—whether it's in the Middle East or anywhere in the world—is predicated on what is necessary for Israel's best interests.

Victor Thorn: We recently watched a videotape that confirms a lot of what you said in *The New Jerusalem*. This videotape took a historic look at the Jewish people and the state of Israel. Basically what it says is that everywhere that the Jewish people have been throughout history, one of three things has happened. They've either been enslaved, they've been driven out, or they've been killed en masse. To what do you attribute this; and also, has there ever been another group of people in history that has experienced the same phenomenon?

Michael Collins Piper: Let me tell you what I told a Jewish friend of mine. I said to him: I look at your Jewish community newspapers, and most of the content of the newspapers is about who the Jews don't like and who the Jews think don't like them.

I used to have a subscription that was sent to me of a Polish community magazine, and I've seen lots of other ethnic community magazines. We had an editor at our old newspaper, *The Spotlight*, who had a lot of friends from Eastern Europe, so we got a lot of ethnic community publications. All these publications were very positive, very forward-looking. They had nice articles about the homeland and articles about community events commemorating some famous Polish American or some famous Italian American, Slavic American, what have you.

But you read a Jewish newspaper, and it's a panorama of anger and hatred for everybody. They're constantly complaining. So, if this is how the Jews act and think as a group—and that's what community newspapers reflect, group think, so to speak—if this is how they're acting in the United States today when they've got more power and influence than they've ever had in any other country in the world, even including Israel, for that matter, I won-

der how they were acting in the old days when they were getting kicked out of all these countries.

All groups at one time or another have had somebody who didn't like them. But for some reason throughout history, the Jewish people have been kicked, at one time or another, out of every European country.

Lisa Guliani: Michael, there's a new wave among the Zionist media elite like William Kristol. They're setting a tone that if you're critical of Israel, you're not only anti-Semitic, but you're also anti-American and anti-Christian. Would you comment briefly on this, please?

Michael Collins Piper: Well, that's of course, absolute nonsense. This is the real propaganda line they're trying to put out now, that (as you say) anyone who is anti-Israel is therefore anti-American. That's an extraordinary claim, and they're also saying that if you're anti-Israel, you're therefore automatically anti-Christian. That's going to come as a big surprise to many of the Christian pastors who are critical of Israel. But as Harry Truman said, they have no sense of proportion, and these people will lie, and tell the biggest lies, and expect people to believe them.

As I always say, as far as U.S. foreign policy in the Middle East is concerned, it's a tissue of lies backed up by bullying, brute force, and lots of double standards to boot. If we see this in our U.S. Middle East policy, we'll also find it in every facet of influence of these hard-line Zionists and their shills in the media.

Victor Thorn: "Deep Throat" has been in the news of late for the last few weeks, and it's been revealed that it's purportedly a gentleman named Mark Felt. One of the people who confirmed this is Bob Woodward, who has a tendency to only let this type of information out when the person isn't able to confirm it. A good example was when he interviewed William Casey on his deathbed. Now, Mark Felt's 91 years old, and he can't really confirm a lot of this information. So, describe your take on "Deep Throat"; and also your take on him being a heavy smoker, which Mark Felt was not.

Also, how he was very literate, which Mark Felt was not, and finally, James Jesus Angleton.

Michael Collins Piper: As far as Mark Felt is concerned, I don't necessarily buy the idea that he was the only "Deep Throat," so to speak. There have been others who have been writing on this, and they all feel pretty strongly that it's safe to suspect that there were other sources. But for whatever reason, and while Mark Felt may have been one of the primary sources, he probably was not just acting as a "lone angel." In fact, he's being portrayed as a hero of sorts. He probably was working for somebody else behind the scenes; and ironically, as I understand it, and I'm still looking into this, it's very likely that Mark Felt would've probably had connections to James Angleton, who you were referring to earlier.

Felt was involved in COINTELPRO, the then-secret FBI program used to infiltrate and disrupt political groups. James Angleton, at the CIA, was running his own "Operation Chaos," which was a similar, totally illegal program because the CIA was not supposed to be operating on American soil. James Angleton's deputy in that program was a guy named Richard Ober; and Debra Davis, in her book entitled *Katharine the Great* on Katharine Graham of *The Washington Post*, makes a very strong case that Richard Ober could have been, and was, in her opinion, "Deep Throat." As I said, it ties directly back to Mark Felt because Felt and Ober were both running related operations.

Ober was a deputy of James Angleton. Now, James Angleton was a known heavy smoker, a notorious chain-smoker, and also by the time he died, a raving alcoholic. He was quite delusional. Bob Woodward and Bernstein, in their book *All the President's Men*, describe "Deep Throat" as having been a heavy smoker and drinker. Now, that description does not fit Mark Felt. So, why they chose to use that description is of interest, because if they were lying about "Deep Throat" trying to cover up, I find it interesting that they would have given a description which sounded a lot like James Angleton.

Lisa Guliani: There's a report out stating that the GOP

dream ticket for 2008 will feature John McCain and Jeb Bush. We don't know how plausible this is, but would you give us a little behind-the-scenes info tying the McCain family to organized crime figure Jim Hensley and the Bronfman family, who are prominent figures in the World Jewish Congress?

Michael Collins Piper: Yes, that is an interesting story. I've told people who like John McCain about this, and they don't want to believe it, or they try to explain it away. Here's what the situation is: John McCain's wife, Cindy, is the daughter of a rather interesting figure named Jim Hensley. Jim Hensley went to jail some years ago—I believe he's dead now—but he took the fall for his boss, a guy named Kemper Marley. Well, Kemper Marley was the guy who ran the state of Arizona—both the Democratic and Republican parties.

As powerful as Kemper Marley was, he was actually the front man for the Bronfman family of Canada. Now that's extraordinary when you think that a family operating in Canada basically was running a U.S. state. Well actually, it may not be as extraordinary because of the fact that Arizona even now has a relatively small population. It's a big state, but has a very small population. If you set your operations up in such a place, you're very well-positioned to be able to do something like that. That's exactly what the Bronfman family did. It was close to Nevada, an outpost of the gambling syndicate.

The Bronfmans were also very much tied up with the Meyer Lansky crime syndicate, so it was all interconnected there. And Jim Hensley, who was John McCain's father-in-law, was the key figure in this criminal enterprise that ran the state of Arizona. His reward for taking the rap for Kemper Marley was to get a major Budweiser beer distributorship that was given to him, and that made him a very wealthy man. Now, of course, it has made John McCain a very wealthy man.

Victor Thorn: Luckily, not all world leaders are under the sway of the Zionists. Two good examples would be Hugo Chavez

down in Venezuela, and also the Malaysian Prime Minister, Mahathir Mohamad. So; do you think others are going to follow this lead, especially in light of a recent meeting that was basically blacked-out in the United States—a meeting that had representatives from twelve South American countries and twenty-two Arab nations?

Michael Collins Piper: What is happening in these South American countries is that everybody's fed up with the power of Israel, and attributes it to the United States letting Israel get away with everything. So, there are more and more people—more and more countries—that feel very free to speak out about Zionist power in America.

Even Vladimir Putin of Russia, while he has not been so outspoken, *per se*, you do find that the Zionist lobby here in America does not really trust or care for Putin. If they could overthrow Putin and install someone to their liking, they would.

Yes, you do find this very serious expression of disregard for the power of Zionism, and I think it's bad for America because we're attaching ourselves to an entity that the people of the world have very little regard for.

Lisa Guliani: I'd like your opinion on the recent French and Dutch "No" votes on the EU Charter.

Michael Collins Piper: They used to say nationalism was bad, that it was old-fashioned and that it was dead. I think what you're seeing now again are expressions of nationalism. People want to maintain the integrity of their own countries and ethnic groups. There's nothing wrong with that. They've always tried to tell us that we should all intermingle and marry and abandon our traditions. There's nothing wrong with preserving and commemorating your nation and your ethnicity. That's essentially what you're seeing an expression of, I would say, in that vote against the European Union.

I know a lot of people who think the European Union is a good idea. I also know a lot of people who think it's a very bad

idea. Frankly, I'm not sure myself. I don't really have a firm opinion on it because I've heard so many good arguments from both sides, but the bottom line is that the Dutch vote is an expression of nationalism.

Victor Thorn: Let's look forward to the 2008 election. Do you think Hillary Clinton is going to land the Democratic nomination, and do you think there's any possibility that she's going to end up in the White House again?

Michael Collins Piper: There's a book that's supposed to be coming out on Hillary Clinton.

Victor Thorn: Ed Klein's *The Truth About Hillary*.

Michael Collins Piper: Yeah, and he's a writer for *Parade* magazine, which is owned by the Newhouse family, one of the big powerful Jewish publishing empires. They own the *Harrisburg Patriot*, among other newspapers. But in any case, I actually have a copy of the *Vanity Fair* article which excerpts this book about Hillary, and in big bold letters highlighted in the middle of the page they have a quote from Senator Pat Moynihan's wife Liz, speaking to Hillary, "The reason you're not doing well in New York," said Liz Moynihan, "is because Jews don't like you." See, this is how powerful political people really talk.

I know that might sound very shocking to many of your viewers, but that's real power-politics talk right there. That's what Mrs. Moynihan told Hillary.

The fact is: there have been a lot of allegations that there are suspicions of Hillary Clinton within the Jewish community. The average American would think that Hillary's a big favorite of the Jews. In fact, when she ran for the Senate in New York and won, she only received 55% of the Jewish vote. Considering the fact that Al Gore—running on the same ticket that year—won 80% of the Jewish vote, I think that indicates there is a little bit of concern about Hillary.

There have been allegations also that she has been very privately quite anti-Semitic in her tone. As a college student at the

time she met Bill Clinton, she was known to be a very strong critic of Israel, a strong supporter of the Palestinians, and had a lot of disregard for U.S. policy in the Middle East. The Jewish people have the ultimate power in selecting the Democratic nominee, which of course they won't admit, but they have a great deal of power there. I think there's enough suspicion of Hillary among the Jewish power elite that I think they'll do everything they can to stop her.

Victor Thorn: One last question. Everyone keeps waiting for what they think is going to be the next "spike" event. We see that the EU Charter is going down the drain over in Europe. We see that war support in this country's going down the drain. We see a lot of resistance to this new CAFTA treaty. We see that George Bush's social security privatization scam is going down the drain. The neo-cons haven't been able to conquer the Middle East; and finally, there's the Downing Street Memo and the heat is still on about 9-11. Do you think that a spike event, something similar to 9-11, is on the horizon in the near future?

Michael Collins Piper: That's a very scary question, Victor. I have this concern about the fact that when these power elites start to lose their grasp, they always need something to recharge their engines. They need to re-establish themselves, to reassert their authority. What better way than another "terrorist" attack?

Victor Thorn: That's the way we see it, because these guys don't like to lose, and it seems like they're being backed into a corner now; and God forbid, we hope another one doesn't happen.

Michael Collins Piper: We know we've been lied to about 9-11, so who was responsible? I don't really know for certain, but I have a pretty good idea, and I don't think it was Osama bin Laden.

CHAPTER NINETEEN

Radio Free America **Oklahoma City Bombing Interview** **with Tom Valentine** **July 6, 1997** (Originally published in *The Spotlight*)

There is growing evidence that the Anti-Defamation League (ADL) of B'nai B'rith was closely monitoring the activities of convicted Oklahoma City bomber Timothy McVeigh long before the tragic April 19, 1995 bombing. What's more, it appears that the ADL itself may have been manipulating McVeigh through an undercover operative in McVeigh's inner circle.

On July 6, 1997 veteran *Spotlight* correspondent Michael Collins Piper appeared as a special guest on Tom Valentine's weekly *Radio Free America* talk forum and discussed the evidence of ADL involvement in McVeigh's activities and brought forth conclusive evidence that the ADL had actively tried to "frame" Liberty Lobby, publisher of *The Spotlight*, for involvement in the crime. What follows is an edited transcript of Piper's appearance on *RFA*.

Tom Valentine: The Anti-Defamation League (ADL) of B'nai B'rith has tried to suggest that Liberty Lobby and *The Spotlight* were in some way "connected" to Timothy McVeigh and therefore involved in the bombing in Oklahoma City.

Michael Collins Piper: Ironically, the truth is quite precisely the opposite. Liberty Lobby and *The Spotlight* have firm evidence that the ADL's so-called "fact finding" division had a source in Timothy McVeigh's inner circle long before the bombing, and that the ADL (through this source) may well have been directing some of McVeigh's activities prior to the bombing. Part of the ADL's manipulation of McVeigh appears to have been a deliberate plan to

implicate Liberty Lobby in McVeigh's activities. Yet, in each and every case, the fine hand of the ADL can be seen. So the big question is: "What did the ADL know, and when did the ADL know it?"

It seems pretty clear that Timothy McVeigh was an active participant in the bombing conspiracy. However, it's also very clear that there were people (specifically the ADL) who knew what McVeigh was doing—and they are as guilty in the bombing as McVeigh if only for the reason that they did nothing to stop him. What's more disturbing, though, is that it appears the ADL was even manipulating him for its own insidious purposes.

Although a lot of people like to talk about "government foreknowledge" of the Oklahoma bombing plot, the fact is that much of that "government foreknowledge" actually came to the FBI and the BATF, and probably even the CIA, from ADL informants active in the "right wing" (and even in the "left wing") in America today.

Don't forget that the ADL even had spies following Dr. Martin Luther King, and those ADL spies then turned that information over to the FBI. So it wasn't really the FBI spying on King (as the media tells us); instead, it was the ADL. So, when you are talking about "government foreknowledge" of the bomb plot, you're really talking, largely, about "ADL foreknowledge" of the plot—and that's something that the ADL doesn't want people to know about. So let's discuss what the ADL did know about Timothy McVeigh.

Tom Valentine: A lot of people across America heard through the mainstream media that Timothy McVeigh was purportedly in the possession of a pre-paid telephone calling card purchased from *The Spotlight*. But you say that there's much more to the story.

Michael Collins Piper: Let me tell you about that calling card. *The Spotlight* sponsored a pre-paid telephone calling card. Many organizations have offered such calling cards. However, we at *The Spotlight* learned after the Oklahoma bombing that somebody—the FBI says it was Timothy McVeigh—had purchased a *Spotlight* calling card and made numerous calls all over the coun-

try in furtherance of the bombing conspiracy.

Here we were, sitting in Washington, D.C., getting thousands of orders for calling cards from all over the country. We had no idea who these people were. We processed their orders, sent out the cards, and people used them. These cards are available to the general public. You don't even have to be a *Spotlight* subscriber, or even a supporter of *The Spotlight's* populist political views, to buy or use this card.

However, here's a very strange thing about the card that we have been told was purchased by McVeigh: the card was purchased by someone using the name "Daryl Bridges." Based upon the evidence, it appears that the card was actually purchased by McVeigh.

The FBI came to *The Spotlight*, and we provided every detail and every bit of documentation we could provide. Although, as I said, all we had evidence of in our records was the fact that somebody using the name "Daryl Bridges" had ordered one of these cards. The name "Timothy McVeigh" did not appear in any of our records, although the card was sent to "Daryl Bridges" at an address in Michigan where, we now know, Timothy McVeigh lived.

The FBI says that this card was used to make calls to purchase supplies for the bomb that was supposedly used in the Oklahoma bombing (although as many people now know, there's strong evidence that, more than likely, there was more than one bomb used).

We didn't have any of the actual records of the calls at our office in Washington. All of the records of the calls are held at the service bureau that handled the calling card program for *The Spotlight*. We didn't know where any of the calls originated, where they were directed, or who was using the card. To repeat, all we knew was that a card had been purchased by one "Daryl Bridges."

Now this is what's interesting: The FBI came back to *The Spotlight* and asked us, "Why did *The Spotlight* make calls using the Daryl Bridges calling card to Timothy McVeigh?" It surprised

us, needless to say, that the FBI was making this allegation.

Here's what appears to have happened. An employee at *The Spotlight* who processed the calling card orders recalls that he received calls here in Washington from somebody who said to them, "Would you please call us back using the calling card to see if the card is working?" (That is, the card registered in the name of "Daryl Bridges.")

So, a *Spotlight* employee used the calling card access number registered to "Daryl Bridges" to call that person back to verify that the card was working. Therefore, a record of that call was made—or, as they would call it in intelligence jargon, a "legend."

In other words, an innocent *Spotlight* employee used that same calling card access number to call back the person who had called *The Spotlight*, and then concluded that the calling card was indeed working. In fact, it appears that this scenario happened on more than one occasion with other calling card customers. Our assumption, of course, was that the person using the card was having some problem in using the card and we were simply trying to help the cardholder iron out the problem.

Now, after the Oklahoma bombing took place and we were notified by the FBI that McVeigh had a *Spotlight* calling card, we obviously told the FBI that we would cooperate in any way we could. However—and this is very disturbing—we learned just recently, in a report from the Scripps-Howard News Service, that the FBI was, even then, trying (behind the scenes and unknown to us) to use the calling card "evidence" to somehow prove that *The Spotlight* had been helping advance McVeigh's efforts in the bombing conspiracy.

Tom Valentine: In other words, *The Spotlight's* role in this scenario was completely innocent, but the FBI was trying to suggest that *The Spotlight* was in communication with McVeigh, presumably helping him in the bomb plot.

Michael Collins Piper: This is the whole crazy thing about it. We were getting these calls in Washington from somebody. We

get hundreds of calls from people daily. We don't really know who is on the other end of the line. However, after all of this information came out about McVeigh's purchase of the calling card (and his purported use of that card) one of our employees did remember calls regarding the "Daryl Bridges" card.

The bottom line is that whoever called *The Spotlight* (whether it was McVeigh or somebody else) was trying to get *The Spotlight* to make outgoing calls using the calling card that the FBI now says was in McVeigh's possession. In fact, the FBI seems to have been suggesting (although it's certainly not true) that McVeigh himself had come to *The Spotlight's* office in Washington and was using our telephone to make the outgoing calls charged to the pre-paid calling card registered to "Daryl Bridges." And what's really interesting, additionally, is that we don't really know whether or not it was even McVeigh who was calling *The Spotlight*. For all we know it could have been someone else. All we know is that the caller was making inquiries about the "Daryl Bridges" card.

But this is only the tip of the iceberg. It gets much deeper and much more interesting. The one thing that we are certain about is that there are people out there—people with long, close ties to the FBI and the BATF—who deliberately attempted to implicate *The Spotlight* and its publisher, Liberty Lobby, in the Oklahoma bombing. We are accusing them of having done this because they knew—in advance—that the bombing was going to happen and they wanted people to believe that *The Spotlight* was involved in this conspiracy.

Tom Valentine: You say that this is only the tip of the iceberg. What else is there that leads you to the conclusion that there was a deliberate attempt to "frame" Liberty Lobby?

Michael Collins Piper: Well, two days after the bombing, we were sitting here in Washington, minding our own business, and *The Washington Post* reported—to our surprise, I must assure you—that the Anti-Defamation League (ADL) of B'nai B'rith had

announced that a year before the bombing Timothy McVeigh, using an alias again, this time, “T. Tuttle,” had taken out a classified advertisement in *The Spotlight*.

Now, we don’t have our classified advertising records on computer, so this was a surprise to us, as I said. We immediately began to wonder how the ADL knew that McVeigh had taken out such an advertisement, particularly since it was under the name “T. Tuttle.”

Here’s the interesting thing: I made several phone calls to check this out. One of the calls I made was to a friendly source who has very high-level connections. I told him about the “T. Tuttle” advertisement and he chuckled and said, “Do you know how the ADL knew that McVeigh had advertised in *The Spotlight*?” I said, “No, tell me.” He responded, “The ADL had a guy in McVeigh’s inner circle, close to McVeigh.”

So the very highly respected ADL, which calls itself a “civil rights organization,” had somebody running with McVeigh, working closely with him. McVeigh had apparently told this person that he was going to take out an advertisement in *The Spotlight* or else—and this is probably the case—that ADL operative suggested to McVeigh that he take out the advertisement in *The Spotlight*.

Only McVeigh and the ADL know for sure what really happened. But if McVeigh is reading these words as they are published in *The Spotlight*, he could do a real public service by letting us know what did happen. By this time, I think, McVeigh has probably figured out for himself what really was going on and he probably knows precisely who this ADL operative is.

The “T. Tuttle” advertisement was for a flare gun, yet the ADL reported that it was some sort of weapon—a rocket launcher. It was a simple flare gun modeled to look like a military weapon. Now at that time, interestingly enough, *The Spotlight* had a policy that we did not carry advertisements for weapons of any kind. However, based upon the ADL’s deliberate distortion of the truth, *The Washington Post*—and subsequently, the nationwide media—

reported that *The Spotlight* had carried an ad for a rocket launcher. And needless to say there's a mighty big difference between a flare gun and a rocket launcher.

Now, as I said, we were trying to figure out how the ADL knew that this advertisement had run, and when our source advised us that the ADL had a "ringer" in McVeigh's inner circle, that explained a lot of things. However, based upon our own subsequent research, we came up with some additional data that confirms even further that the ADL was up to its neck in McVeigh's covert affairs for a long time prior to the bombing.

This gets even more interesting, as you'll see. *The Washington Post* report regarding "T. Tuttle" (based upon a press release by the ADL) appeared only in the early edition of *The Washington Post* on April 21—two days after the bombing. However, that same story ran, almost verbatim, in the later edition that day, but in that later edition the *Post* deleted the reference to the ADL and its allegations regarding "T. Tuttle."

Now this is my personal speculation, but I think it's based upon reality: the reason why *The Washington Post* deleted this information was because within the period immediately after it was reported that the ADL had discovered that their own information was incorrect, and that they (the ADL) realized by that time that the incorrect nature of their information pointed to one little (or one big) problem: the fact that the ADL had incorrect information actually points toward the fact that the ADL knew, in advance, about Tim McVeigh's plans to advertise in *The Spotlight*.

Here's the evidence which indicts the ADL of having foreknowledge of Timothy McVeigh's plans to conduct an advertising campaign in *The Spotlight*: although "T. Tuttle" (presumably McVeigh) had contracted to run an ad in four consecutive issues of *The Spotlight*, the advertisement did not run the first week (in the issue of August 9, 1993) in which it was scheduled to run. The ad did not run until one week later in the August 16, 1993 issue.

However, when the ADL went to *The Washington Post* and

told them that McVeigh had run an advertisement in *The Spotlight*, the ADL claimed that the ad had run in the August 9 issue. Although the ADL knew that McVeigh had contracted to run an ad in the August 9 issue, what the ADL didn't know was that we had a production problem in-house at *The Spotlight* and that the ad did not run as initially intended.

What happened was that the ADL, based upon its own pre-knowledge of McVeigh's intentions to advertise in *The Spotlight*, eagerly went public after the bombing to announce that McVeigh had advertised in *The Spotlight*. Then the ADL realized that they had made a mistake and they turned around and went to the *Post* and evidently told them to "shut up and forget about it," which the *Post* did. You won't even find that early edition of the *Post* in the Library of Congress. It's gone down the Memory Hole.

Here's something else rather interesting. *The Spotlight's* managing editor had actually noticed the "T. Tuttle" advertisement and thought that there was something strange about it. He pulled the ad, saying: "We don't run ads for weapons in *The Spotlight*," and the ad only ran in three issues, rather than in four issues as scheduled. Yet, the ADL had in its records the information that Timothy McVeigh, using the name "T. Tuttle" had—more than a year before the Oklahoma bombing—advertised in *The Spotlight*.

The FBI need not come to me or to anyone on *The Spotlight* staff and ask any of us about any association with Timothy McVeigh. I would say to the FBI's Louis Freeh: "What did the ADL know about Timothy McVeigh, and when did they know it?" *The Spotlight* didn't know anything. It's a very big question.

The Oklahoma City grand jury investigating the bombing could, and should, call as witnesses people from the ADL such as Abe Foxman, the ADL national director, Irwin Suall, the ADL's longtime "fact finding" director, and Mira Lansky Boland, the "former" CIA officer who runs the ADL office in Washington.

If the grand jury pushed the matter they could actually indict Foxman, Suall and Boland for pre-knowledge of the activities of

Timothy McVeigh and indict them for conspiracy in the bombing.

This is a lot of eye-opening information for people to digest—information that's not been reported anywhere except by *The Spotlight*—but people need to think about it carefully and start asking, “What's going on here?”

Tom Valentine: But the conspiracy to frame Liberty Lobby goes even further, doesn't it?

Michael Collins Piper: That's right. And at this juncture I'm going to relate some rather unsettling facts which prove beyond any question that somebody other than Timothy McVeigh knew that there was going to be a bombing in Oklahoma City. Yet, the federal prosecutors are saying that only McVeigh and Terry Nichols were involved in the conspiracy, and that only Michael Fortier and his wife had any pre-knowledge of the conspiracy. Yet there's hard evidence that proves that somebody else was also involved.

Now the Oklahoma City bombing happened on April 19, 1995. On April 20—the day after the bombing—a mail clerk at *The Spotlight* opened an envelope postmarked “Oklahoma City” that was mailed to *The Spotlight* on April 17, two days before the bombing. That postmark was put there by the United States government—the post office. You can't get any more “official” than that. This is not a conspiracy theory. This is a fact. *The Spotlight* did not put that postmark there. The post office did it. This envelope and its contents were mailed before the bombing.

Inside that envelope was a postcard. Now we received it the day after the bombing when everybody in the country knew that there had been this tragedy in Oklahoma City. The postcard in the envelope was a Depression era photograph which depicted a dust storm over Oklahoma. The caption indicated that the photograph depicted a dust storm approaching Oklahoma and this picture (which is rather famous and which I am sure I had seen before) was entitled *Black Sunday*.

I don't think it's any coincidence that there was a popular

Hollywood motion picture some years ago about terrorism in America, and it too was entitled *Black Sunday*.

You can imagine how the ladies in our mailroom reacted when they saw this postcard (mailed from Oklahoma City two days before the bombing) depicting a “Black Sunday” over Oklahoma one day after a tragic bombing in Oklahoma City that killed 168 men, women and children.

There was something else in the envelope. It was a photocopy of an article that was published in *The Spotlight* twelve years before. It was an article about Gordon Kahl, an American patriot whose story is well known to readers of *The Spotlight*. Kahl was a critic of the federal government, and in 1983 he died at the hands of federal agents.

The fact that there was an article about Gordon Kahl also in the envelope (along with the Black Sunday postcard) is interesting inasmuch as after Kahl’s death there were allegations that admirers of Gordon Kahl had actually plotted to blow up the Murrah Federal Building in Oklahoma City in retaliation for Kahl’s death. One of the people purportedly involved in the plot apparently had an explosive blow up in his hand, and that was one of the reasons why that plot was supposedly never carried through.

In any normal person’s judgment, the envelope containing the postcard and the article on Gordon Kahl was clearly some sort of “warning” or notation that something was going to happen in Oklahoma City. So there was indeed a “dust storm” over Oklahoma on April 19, 1995, and the person who mailed that envelope and its contents knew about it in advance. It is as simple as that. It’s not a conspiracy theory. It’s a fact.

Tom Valentine: There was no name or any return address on the envelope or any of its contents—no direct message of any kind therein?

Michael Collins Piper: That’s correct. The whole production was entirely anonymous, but it was mailed from Oklahoma City two days before the bombing. The contents appeared to us to be

evidence that somebody knew that there was going to be a “dust storm” (a “Black Sunday”) in Oklahoma. We were shocked by this and we called our attorney, Mark Lane, and he rushed over to our office immediately.

Mark then put this envelope, the postcard, and the accompanying article in an envelope and sent it directly to Attorney General Janet Reno. Mark knows Janet Reno personally, and he sent it directly to her office. In fact, Mark’s wife actually hand-carried it directly to the Justice Department; so we knew, at that point, that the Justice Department had actually received the documents in question.

Now, although we were, during the subsequent weeks and months ahead, cooperating with the FBI and providing them information from our files relating to Timothy McVeigh’s purchase of the pre-paid calling card, we never heard anything further about this mailing from Oklahoma City.

In the meantime, I passed this information about the mailing on to Jim Ridgeway, a nationally-known journalist who writes for the *Village Voice*, a left-wing weekly. Neither Ridgeway nor the *Village Voice* has any sympathies whatsoever with *The Spotlight*. Ridgeway, however, contacted the FBI, and the FBI initially told Ridgeway that they (the FBI) knew nothing about the “warning.” However, I had sent Ridgeway photocopies of the postcard, the envelope, and the article that Mark Lane had preserved for our own files. So Ridgeway pressed the FBI further, and they then said, “Oh yes,” and finally the FBI spokesman had to come up with some sort of response: “We haven’t said anything publicly in regards [sic] to that.”

In other words, the FBI was admitting that they had received this explosive information—no pun intended, I assure you—and that they had not said anything publicly about it. Why not? This is evidence that there was foreknowledge of the impending bombing by somebody, but since it doesn’t appear to be the handwriting of Timothy McVeigh on the envelope, the federal government is actu-

ally—not figuratively—covering it up.

If we at *The Spotlight* had not taken this information to the FBI through our attorney, we feel quite certain that somehow the FBI would have “learned” (probably from the ADL) that the envelope (this “warning”) had been sent to *The Spotlight* and that we perhaps had foreknowledge ourselves that something was going to happen. Then that would have given the ADL and their friends at the FBI something firm to hang on *The Spotlight*, and the consequences could have been tragic indeed.

All of this taken together illustrates what we have said in a special report that’s been mailed to readers of *The Spotlight*: somebody involved in the bombing was trying to entangle Liberty Lobby in the conspiracy, almost two years before the crime!

Frankly, we believe that “somebody” is just who we’ve suggested: the ADL—an intelligence arm of the government of Israel—which has been trying to destroy Liberty Lobby for years, angry that Liberty Lobby has been the one constant voice crying out against ADL manipulation of U.S. foreign policy.

Putting the known facts together, the evidence adds up to an indisputable conclusion:

(1) *Someone* tried very hard to make repeated connections between LIBERTY LOBBY and Timothy McVeigh and to make it appear that we had foreknowledge of the bombing;

(2) That “someone” did have foreknowledge of the bombing conspiracy; and


(3) Whoever had foreknowledge of the bombing was part of the conspiracy resulting in the cold-blooded murder of 168 innocent Americans.

Based upon the information outlined, LIBERTY LOBBY accuses the ADL and its top officials of having foreknowledge of the impending bombing. If these ADL officials—and/or others—had foreknowledge of the bombing conspiracy, they should join Timothy McVeigh on death row for their role in the worst terrorist act in American history.

Evidence now indicates that certain federal officials in the FBI and the BATF also knew in advance of the bombing conspiracy. And it's also very possible that federal undercover informants were acting as *agents provocateurs*, actively assisting in the conspiracy. The full story of the role of, for example, Andreas Strassmeir and his attorney, the enigmatic Kirk Lyons, has yet to be told.

But the bottom line is this: Timothy McVeigh is clearly not the only person who should be facing the death penalty. Yet, despite all this real evidence, federal authorities, prodded by the ADL, were trying to find LIBERTY LOBBY complicit in the conspiracy. They don't want the real truth to come out. It is clear: the same criminals who bombed the Murrah Building tried to implicate Liberty Lobby and *The Spotlight* in this crime.





SECTION FOUR

Reviews

CHAPTER TWENTY

An Overview of Michael Collins Piper's *Final Judgment: The Missing Link in the JFK Assassination Conspiracy* January 10, 2003 Victor Thorn

Prior to delving into this extensive overview on Michael Collins Piper's *Final Judgment*, I'd like to make one thing perfectly clear—questioning or being critical of Israel does not connote anti-Semitism—and any argument to the contrary is simple obfuscation. I have been studying the Kennedy assassination for over a decade, and my sole purpose in writing this analysis is to not only expose which forces were ultimately responsible for JFK's murder, but also how that tragedy parallels certain events taking place in the world today.

I am not interested in unjustly targeting one particular group or class of people, nor do I harbor any prejudices ('to pre-judge') against any particular group or class of people. If anyone's objections to the premise of this overview are based solely on race or religion, they are either being disingenuous, deceptive, or are trying to divert attention away from the main thesis. The same applies to Mr. Piper's work, which is in its fifth printing with over 25,000 copies in circulation. In fact, Mr. Piper says about *Final Judgment*: "Not one person has yet come forward to refute in any way any single fact relating to my theory as it appears in *Final Judgment*."

With the above disclaimer in mind, it is important for us to understand three important points that will be touched upon dur-

ing the course of this essay:

1) The psychological mind-frame of certain Israeli leaders prior to the time of JFK's assassination played an undeniably important role in his demise.

2) One of the brutal realities of life is that America's Central Intelligence Agency is a criminally corrupt entity that works hand-in-hand in an ongoing basis with certain elements of Organized Crime.

3) The nation of Israel (via the Mossad), in unison with the CIA and the Mob, orchestrated the killing of our 35th president.

Although this premise is highly controversial, Piper differs from other researchers in one very important way. Where they allude to the assassins in vague, non-specific terms, such as the "Military-Industrial Complex," "the Mob," "CIA," "Cubans," and the "Russians," Piper is very meticulous in identifying who he feels was responsible for JFK's assassination. Even more important is the fact that the same forces that called the shots in 1963 are still in operation today, and the events that have resulted since 9-11 eerily parallel those of 40 years ago. Thus, in an attempt to remind people of the past and to expose what actually took place so that we are not condemned to repeat it, I will present a comprehensive overview of Michael Collins Piper's *Final Judgment*. Upon completion, I guarantee you'll view certain historical forces in a light you've never considered before.

JFK, The Atomic Bomb, and Israel's War Machine

"Israel need not apologize for the assassination or destruction of those who seek to destroy it. The first order of business for any country is the protection of its people."

Washington Jewish Week,

October 9, 1997

In March, 1992, Illinois Representative Paul Findley said in *The Washington Report on Middle East Affairs*, “It is interesting—but not surprising—to note that in all the words written and uttered about the Kennedy assassination, Israel’s intelligence agency, the Mossad, has never been mentioned.”

Considering that the Mossad is quite possibly the most ruthless and efficient intelligence agency in the world, it is peculiar that they have never been scrutinized in relation to the Kennedy assassination, especially when practically every other entity in the world (short of Elvis impersonators) has been implicated. But that all changed in January, 1994 with the release of Michael Collins Piper’s *Final Judgment*. In this book, Piper says, “Israel’s Mossad was a primary (and critical) behind the scenes player in the conspiracy that ended the life of JFK. Through its own vast resources and through its international contacts in the intelligence community and in organized crime, Israel had the means, it had the opportunity, and it had the motive to play a major front-line role in the crime of the century – and it did.

Their motive? Israel’s much touted Prime Minister David Ben-Gurion, who ruled that country from its inception in 1948 until he resigned on June 16, 1963, was so enraged at John F. Kennedy for not allowing Israel to become a nuclear power that, Piper asserts, in his final days in office he commanded the Mossad to become involved in a plot to kill America’s president.

Ben-Gurion was so convinced that Israel’s very survival was in dire jeopardy that in one of his final letters to JFK he said, “Mr. President, my people have the right to exist, and this existence is in danger.”

In the days leading up to Ben-Gurion’s resignation from office, he and JFK had been involved in an unpublicized, contentious debate over the possibility of Israel getting nuclear capabilities. Their disagreement eventually escalated into a full-fledged war of words that was virtually ignored in the press. Ethan Bronner wrote about this secret battle between JFK and

Ben-Gurion years later in a *New York Times* article on October 31, 1998, calling it a “fiercely hidden subject.” In fact, the Kennedy/Ben-Gurion conversations are still classified by the United States government. Maybe this is the case because Ben-Gurion’s rage and frustration became so intense—and his power so great within Israel—that Piper contends it was at the center of the conspiracy to kill John Kennedy. This stance is supported by New York banker Abe Feinberg, who describes the situation as such: “Ben-Gurion could be vicious, and he had such a hatred of the old man [Joe Kennedy, Sr., JFK’s father].” Ben-Gurion despised Joe Kennedy because he felt that not only was he an anti-Semite, but that he had also sided with Hitler during the 1930’s and 40’s. [We will touch upon this aspect of the story later in this article].

Anyway, Ben-Gurion was convinced that Israel needed nuclear weapons to insure its survival, while Kennedy was dead-set against it. This inability to reach an agreement caused obvious problems. One of them revolved around Kennedy’s decision that he would make America his top priority in regard to foreign policy, and not Israel! Kennedy planned to honor the 1950 Tripartite Declaration which said that the United States would retaliate against any nation in the Middle East that attacked any other country. Ben-Gurion, on the other hand, wanted the Kennedy Administration to sell them offensive weapons, particularly Hawk missiles.

The two leaders thus engaged in a brutal letter exchange, but Kennedy wouldn’t budge. Ben-Gurion, obsessed by this issue, slipped into total paranoia, feeling that Kennedy’s obstinance was a blatant threat to the very existence of Israel as a nation. Piper writes, “Ben-Gurion had devoted a lifetime creating a Jewish State and guiding it into the world arena. And, in Ben-Gurion’s eyes, John F. Kennedy was an enemy of the Jewish people and his beloved state of Israel.” He continues, “The ‘nuclear option’ was not only at the very core of Ben-Gurion’s personal world view, but

the very foundation of Israel's national security policy.”

Ben-Gurion was so preoccupied with obtaining nuclear weapons that on June 27, 1963, eleven days after resigning from office, he announced, “I do not know of any other nation whose neighbors declare that they wish to terminate it, and not only declare, but prepare for it by all means available to them. We must have no illusions that what is declared every day in Cairo, Damascus, and Iraq are just words. This is the thought that guides the Arab leaders ... I am confident ... that science is able to provide us with the weapons that will serve the peace and deter our enemies.”

Avner Cohen, in *Israel and the Bomb*, published by Columbia University Press, reinforces this sense of urgency by writing, “Imbued with lessons of the Holocaust, Ben-Gurion was consumed by fears of security ... Anxiety about the Holocaust reached beyond Ben-Gurion to infuse Israel's military thinking.” He further adds fuel to this point by pointing out, “Ben-Gurion had no qualms about Israel's need for weapons of mass destruction,” and “Ben-Gurion's world view and his decisive governing style shaped his critical role in instigating Israel's nuclear progress.”

Kennedy, on the other hand, was adamant in his refusal to promote Israel's ascension to the nuclear stage. Avner Cohen, in *Israel and the Bomb*, stresses, “No American president was more concerned with the danger of nuclear proliferation than John Fitzgerald Kennedy. He was convinced that the spread of nuclear weapons would make the world more dangerous and undermine U.S. interests.” Cohen continues at the end of this passage, “The only example Kennedy used to make this point was Israel.”

Realizing that Kennedy would not change his mind, Ben-Gurion decided to join forces with Communist China. Both countries were greatly interested in creating nuclear programs, and so began their secret joint dealings. Working in unison through intermediary Shaul Eisenberg, who was a partner of Mossad gun-runner and accountant Tibor Rosenbaum, Israel and China proceed-

ed to develop their own nuclear capabilities without the knowledge of the United States.

If you find this scenario improbable, I strongly urge you to read Gordon Thomas' excellent book, *Seeds of Fire*, where he exposes how the Mossad and CSIS (Chinese secret service) have conspired on many occasions to not only steal American military secrets, but to also doctor U.S. intelligence programs such as the Justice Department's PROMISE software. This instance, I am afraid to say, is but the first where echoes of the JFK assassination can still be felt today reverberating through our post 9-11 world. The danger of Israel developing the Bomb in unison with China became a highly volatile situation, and was closely monitored by the CIA.

Intent on pursuing this path, the Israelis constructed a nuclear facility at Dimona. When Kennedy demanded that the U.S. inspect this plant, Ben-Gurion was so incensed that he erected another phony facility that held no evidence of nuclear research and development. (Does this scenario sound eerily familiar to the game we're playing with Saddam Hussein in Iraq right now?) Fully aware of their shenanigans, though, JFK told Charles Bartlett, "The sons of bitches lie to me constantly about their nuclear capability."

Avner Cohen, in *Israel and the Bomb*, reiterates this claim by saying that Ben-Gurion had taken the nuclear issue so closely to heart that he, "concluded that he could not tell the truth about Dimona to American leaders, not even in private."

Dr. Gerald M. Steinberg, political science professor at Bar-Ilan University's BESA Center for Strategic Studies in Tel Aviv, weighs in by saying, "Between 1961 and 1963, the Kennedy administration placed a great deal of pressure on Ben-Gurion in the effort to pressure for acceptance of international inspection of Dimona and Israeli abdication of their nuclear weapons. This pressure apparently did not alter Israeli policy, but it was a contributing factor to Ben-Gurion's resignation in 1963."

To convey how serious this situation had become in modern terms, look at what is happening in Iraq with United Nations security teams inspecting the royal palaces and bunkers for nuclear weapons and materials. This matter is so urgent that our nation is on the verge of war. Forty years earlier, the heat that JFK was placing on Ben-Gurion was equally as strong as what George Bush is laying on Saddam Hussein today.

In *Israel and the Bomb*, Avner Cohen reinforces this point. “To force Ben-Gurion to accept the conditions, Kennedy exerted the most useful leverage available to an American president in dealing with Israel: a threat that an unsatisfactory solution would jeopardize the U.S. government’s commitment to, and support of, Israel.”

The pressure on Ben-Gurion was so immense that he ended up leaving office. But Kennedy, in true pit-bull style, didn’t let up on Ben-Gurion’s successor, Levi Eshkol, as Avner Cohen reports. “Kennedy told Eshkol that the U.S. commitment and support of Israel ‘could be seriously jeopardized’ if Israel did not let the U.S. obtain ‘reliable information’ about its efforts in the nuclear field. Kennedy’s demands were unprecedented. They amounted, in effect, to an ultimatum.” Cohen concludes this thought by asserting, “Kennedy’s letter precipitated a near-crisis situation in Eshkol’s office.”

In the end, as we’re all aware, Kennedy was assassinated in November 1963; but less known is that China conducted its first nuclear test in October, 1964. What makes this event more profound is Piper’s claim that even though Israel said its first nuclear tests took place in 1979, they actually occurred in October, 1964 along with the Chinese! If this is true, other than August, 1945 when the United States dropped atomic bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki, October 1964 may have possibly been the most dangerous month in 20th century history.

Let’s return, though, to JFK’s assassination and the direct results of it in regard to the Jewish lobby, American foreign policy, and the militarization of Israel. To understand how powerful

the Israeli lobby is in this country, venerable Senator J. William Fulbright told CBS *Face the Nation* on April 15, 1973, “Israel controls the U.S. Senate. The Senate is subservient, much too much; we should be more concerned about U.S. interests rather than doing the bidding of Israel. The great majority of the Senate of the U.S.—somewhere around 80%—is completely in support of Israel; anything Israel wants; Israel gets. This has been demonstrated time and again, and this has made [foreign policy] difficult for our government.”

Do you hear what Senator Fulbright said? This isn’t a crazy conspiracy theorist or a KKK anti-Semite. It’s a much-respected U.S. Senator saying that about 80% of the Senate is in Israel’s hip pocket. Adding clout to this argument is Rep. Paul Findley, who was quoted in *The Washington Report on Middle East Affairs* in March, 1992, “During John Kennedy’s campaign for the presidency, a group of New York Jews had privately offered to meet his campaign expenses if he would let them set his Middle East policy. He did not agree ... As the president, he provided only limited support of Israel.”

To understand how important Kennedy’s decisions were during his short-lived presidency, we need to look at the issue of campaign finance. Considering how influential the Israeli lobby is in the U.S. Senate (hearkening back to the words of Senator Fulbright), they had to have been enraged when President Kennedy genuinely wanted to cut the knees out from under the current campaign finance methods because it made politicians so reliant upon the huge cash inlays of special-interest groups. Regrettably, Kennedy did not have the time to implement this program, and to this day our political system is still monopolized by lobbyists from the very same special-interest groups. One can only imagine what changes would have occurred in regard to our foreign policy had Kennedy eradicated these vipers and blood-suckers from the halls of Congress.

Tragically, Kennedy’s ideas never came to fruition, and his

heated battle with Prime Minister Ben-Gurion over whether Israel should be allowed to develop a nuclear program was ultimately lost. The reason why is that Lyndon Baines Johnson, who Kennedy intended to drop from his ticket in 1964 due to his extreme dislike for, had a complete reversal in foreign policy. As you will see, not only did Israel's nuclear program move ahead unchecked; they also became the primary beneficiary of our foreign aid.

But this absolute turnaround would not have occurred if Kennedy would not have been assassinated. Up until LBJ became president, Kennedy dealt with the Middle East in a way that most benefited the U.S. His primary goal—one which would most keep the peace—was a balance of power in the Middle East where each and every nation would be secure. This decision adhered to the Tripartite Declaration which the U.S. signed in 1950. But under the Johnson administration, this fragile balance was overturned, and by 1967—only four years after Kennedy's assassination—the U.S. was Israel's main weapons supplier, and our best interests were put well behind those of Israel!

As Michael Collins Piper writes: "The bottom line is this: JFK was adamantly determined to stop Israel from building the nuclear bomb. LBJ simply looked the other way. JFK's death did indeed prove beneficial to Israel's nuclear ambitions and the evidence proves it."

Reuven Pedatzer, in a review of Avner Cohen's *Israel and the Bomb* in the Israeli Newspaper *Ha'aretz* on February 5, 1999 wrote, "The murder of American president John F. Kennedy brought to an abrupt end the massive pressure being applied by the U.S. administration on the government of Israel to discontinue their nuclear program." He continues, "Kennedy made it quite clear to the Israeli Prime Minister that he would not under any circumstances agree to Israel becoming a nuclear state." Pedatzer concludes, "Had Kennedy remained alive, it is doubtful whether Israel would today have a nuclear option," and that,

“Ben-Gurion’s decision to resign in 1963 was taken to a large extent against the background of the tremendous pressure that Kennedy was applying on him concerning the nuclear issue.”

If you’re still not convinced; how about some numbers? In Kennedy’s last fiscal budget year of 1964, Israeli aid was \$40 million. In LBJ’s first budget of 1965, it soared to \$71 million, and in 1966 more than tripled from two years earlier to \$130 million! Plus, during Kennedy’s administration, almost none of our aid to Israel was military in nature. Instead, it was split equally between development loans and food assistance under the PL480 Program. Yet in 1965 under the Johnson administration, 20% of our aid to Israel was for the military, while in 1966, 71% was used for war-related materials.

Continuing in this same vein, in 1963 the Kennedy administration sold 5 Hawk missiles to Israel as part of an air-defense system. In 1965-66, though, LBJ laid 250 tanks on Israel, 48 Skyhawk attack aircrafts, plus guns and artillery which were all offensive in nature. If you ever wondered when the Israeli War Machine was created, this is it! LBJ was its father.

According to Stephen Green in *Taking Sides: America’s Secret Relations with a Militant Israel*, “The \$92 million in military assistance provided in fiscal year 1966 was greater than the total of all official military aid provided to Israel cumulatively in all the years going back to the foundation of that nation in 1948.”

Green continues, “70% of all U.S. official assistance to Israel has been military. America has given Israel over \$17 billion in military aid since 1946, virtually all of which—over 99%—has been provided since 1965.”

Can you see what’s happening here? Within two years of JFK’s assassination, Israel went from being a weak, outmatched member of the volatile Middle Eastern community that was not allowed to develop nuclear weapons to one that was well on its way to becoming an undeniable military force on the world stage. John Kennedy adamantly put his foot down and refused to allow

Israel to develop a nuclear program, while LBJ bent over backward to facilitate and bolster them. Or, as Seymour Hersh wrote in *The Samson Option*, “By 1968, the president had no intention of doing anything to stop the Israeli bomb.”

The result of this shift in focus from the Kennedy to Johnson administration is, in my opinion, the primary reason behind our current troubles in the Middle East which culminated in the 9-11 attacks and our upcoming war with Iraq (and beyond). I have a great deal of confidence in this statement, for as Michael Collins Piper points out, here are the results of John F. Kennedy’s assassination:

1) Our foreign and military aid to Israel increased dramatically once LBJ became president.

2) Rather than trying to maintain a balance in the Middle East, Israel suddenly emerged as the dominant force.

3) Since the LBJ administration, Israel has always had weaponry that was superior to any of its direct neighbors.

4) Due to this undeniable and obvious increase in Israel’s War Machine, a constant struggle has been perpetuated in the Middle East.

5) LBJ also allowed Israel to proceed with its nuclear development, resulting in them becoming the 5th largest nuclear force in the world.

6) Finally, our huge outlays of foreign aid to Israel (approximately \$10 billion/year when all is said and done) have created a situation of never-ending attacks and retaliation in the Middle East, plus outright scorn and enmity against the U.S. for playing the role of Israel’s military enabler.

In Israel’s, and especially David Ben-Gurion’s eyes then, what were their alternatives—to remain weakened (or at least balanced) in relation to their neighbors and handcuffed by JFK’s refusal to bow to their will, or kill the one man standing in their way to becoming dominant in the Middle East, the recipient of huge

amounts of military aid, and one of the premier nuclear forces in the world? It's something to think about. Also, while these thoughts are running through your head, ask yourself this question. If Kennedy, LBJ, and all subsequent administrations would have adhered to the 1950 Tripartite Declaration and did everything in their power to maintain balance in the Middle East instead of pushing Israel to the forefront, would our Towers have been attacked on 9-11, 2001, and would we be on the verge of a possibly catastrophic war today? It's certainly something to ponder.

THE CIA'S ROLE IN JFK'S ASSASSINATION

Quite possibly the most important court trial of the 1990's (yes, even more relevant than O.J. Simpson) was E. Howard Hunt vs. *The Spotlight* newspaper. Although I won't delve into the circumstances surrounding it, juror Leslie Armstrong told *The Spotlight* in their November 11, 1991 issue, "Mr. Lane [representing the defendant] was asking us [the jury] to do something very difficult. He was asking us to believe John Kennedy had been killed by our own government. Yet when we examined the evidence closely, we were compelled to conclude that the CIA had indeed killed President Kennedy." This information is extremely important to 20th century history, yet the mainstream media gave it virtually no coverage due to its explosive nature. I suppose they were saving everything to see if O.J.'s glove fit.

The vital point being made, and one confirmed by the Church Committee in 1975, was that a conspiracy to assassinate President Kennedy did exist, and that it extended directly into the U.S. Government. To fully understand the ramifications of this information, one needs to be aware of what the CIA has been doing since it formed out of the OSS after WWII. Although time prevents me from engaging in a lengthy discourse, you should research "Project Paperclip" where Nazi scientists were secretly relocated to America after the war. You can also investigate the CIA's illegal mind control experiments, their illicit drug tests on

unwitting subjects, their drug trafficking activities, how they've successfully infiltrated the American corporate media, and their assassinations of various world leaders. In other words, these guys have, and still are, dirty up to their eyeballs.

To fully understand not only this branch of intelligence, but also the broader spectrum of how our world works, we need to realize that what is depicted on the nightly news is not an accurate representation of reality. Rather, the true impetus, or driving force behind our global political system, is rarely ever seen by the American public. The real decision-makers lurk in the shadows, plotting and planning, then using their 'operational arms' such as the CIA, Mossad, other intelligence agencies, and Organized Crime to do their bidding. As Michael Collins Piper tells us, these groups—the money launderers, drug dealers, killers and crooks—are the only entities able to operate outside of societal laws and mores. The Controllers—international bankers, heads of multinational corporations, and top ranking members of secret societies—"guide" our world, then use their "implementers" to carry out their decisions. Politicians are one of the "guises" used in front of the scenes, while the CIA, Mossad, and Mob take care of their dirty dealings far removed from public scrutiny. I'm sorry to say it, but this is the way our world operates.

One of the primary reasons that John F. Kennedy got assassinated was because he dared to interfere with this tenuous framework of power. More specifically, JFK, realizing how out-of-control these various agencies were, wanted to rein them in and bring them all under one roof, giving his brother Bobby jurisdiction over all of them. He also planned on getting rid of master-manipulator J. Edgar Hoover (who was very aware of their plans, but out of sheer self-interest had no incentive to uncover the truth about Kennedy's murder). To make matters worse for himself, Kennedy fired CIA Director Allen Dulles, who was one of the dirtiest backroom wheeler-dealers of all time. (Incredibly, Dulles would later serve on the Warren Commission! Talk about having

the deck stacked against you.)

Arthur Krock wrote in *The New York Times* about this battle between Kennedy and the CIA on October 3, 1963, saying that the CIA “represents a tremendous power and total unaccountability to anyone.” Krock also referred to someone close to Kennedy in the White House who said that if anyone ever tried to take over the U.S. Government, it would be the CIA, and that JFK was no longer able to keep them in reins. Now remember, this was only a month-and-a-half before that fateful day in Dallas.

Reinforcing how out-of-control the CIA was at this time, attorney and researcher Mark Lane wrote in *The Spotlight* on February 17, 1992, “President Kennedy sent Henry Cabot Lodge, his Ambassador to Vietnam, with orders to the CIA on two separate occasions and in both cases the CIA ignored these orders, saying that it was different from what the agency thought should be done. In other words, the CIA had decided that it—not the president—would make the decisions as to how American foreign policy should be conducted.”

Is this situation starting to become clearer to you? Can you see to what proportions the CIA had grown? Kennedy was treading through very treacherous waters, but the straw that broke the camel’s back was only reported years later by *The New York Times* on April 25, 1966. It seems that Kennedy was so intent on exercising his ELECTED powers and not allowing them to be usurped by power-crazed individuals in the intelligence community that he threatened to “splinter the CIA in a thousand pieces and scatter it to the wind.” By uttering these words, Kennedy’s fate was sealed, for now he had struck at the very core of the Controllers’ power center!

In essence, Michael Collins Piper points out that Kennedy had done, or intended to do, four things that filled the CIA with rage:

- 1) Fired Allen Dulles.
- 2) Was in the process of founding a panel that would investigate the CIA’s numerous crimes.

3) Put a damper on the breadth and scope of the CIA.

4) Limit their ability to act under National Security Memorandum 55. Colonel Fletcher Prouty spoke of the CIA's reaction. "Nothing I had ever been involved with in my entire career had created such an uproar. NSAM 55 stripped the CIA of its cherished covert operations goal, except for some small actions. It was an explosive document. The military-industrial complex was not pleased."

One of these incensed individuals was CIA Chief of Counter-Intelligence, James Jesus Angleton. Assuming this post in 1954 under the guidance of two truly dirty dogs—Allen Dulles and Richard Helms—Peter Dale Scott wrote in *Deep Politics and the Death of JFK* that Angleton "managed a 'second CIA' within the CIA." Angleton operated so far beyond his legal parameters that he, along with William Harvey, formed the ZR/Rifle Team and hired the shooters who were to take out Cuban leader Fidel Castro. And although I won't delve into details at this point, Piper points out in *Final Judgment* that these were the same trigger men used for the Kennedy assassination.

More importantly, Angleton formed an extremely close relationship with the Mossad and David Ben-Gurion, and was fully aware of the Israeli Prime Minister's hatred for JFK. Angleton became so intimate with the Israelis that he even helped them develop their secret nuclear program, while the CIA and Mossad became as one in the Middle East—a virtually indistinguishable entity working in unison to carry out their mutual goals.

The Mossad, you must know, has been called by Michael Collins Piper "the driving force behind the conspiracy" to kill JFK. Andrew Cockburn, appearing on C-Span's *Booknotes* on September 1, 1991, described their relationship with American intelligence. "There has been since almost the earliest days of the

Israeli state and the earliest days of the CIA a secret bond, basically by which Israeli intelligence did jobs for the CIA and the rest of American intelligence. You can't understand what's going on with American covert operations and the Israeli covert operations until you understand this secret arrangement."

Another extremely important point that Michael Collins Piper brings up in *Final Judgment* is that during the time of Kennedy's assassination, Yitzhak Shamir (later Israeli Prime Minister) was the head of a Mossad hit squad that hired a trigger man from the SDECE (French intelligence) to kill President Kennedy. This information is confirmed by the Israeli newspaper *Ha'aretz* on July 3, 1992 when they reported that Yitzhak Shamir was once an underworld terrorist that became a Mossad agent, then later led an assassination team from 1955-1964. *The Washington Times* lends further credibility to this stance by reporting on July 4, 1992 that not only did this secret assassination team exist, but that they "carried out attacks on perceived enemies and suspected Nazi war criminals." If you remember, David Ben-Gurion called JFK an "enemy of the state of Israel." From my perspective, that would make him a PERCEIVED ENEMY!

Now, if we consider for a moment that Yitzhak Shamir hired one of the hit men from France's secret service—the SDECE—what makes this situation even more bizarre is who James Jesus Angleton—the primary CIA force behind Kennedy's assassination—was with on the afternoon of November 22, 1963. It was Colonel Georges de Lannurien, Deputy Chief of the SDECE! They were both at CIA headquarters in Langley to get ready for hands-on damage control in case something went awry. In effect, then, we have the triangulation of three intelligence agencies—the CIA, Mossad, and SDECE—all converging around the murder of President Kennedy, while they made certain that Lee Harvey Oswald had already established links with Cuba and the Soviet Union so that a Communist "Cold War" cover story could be forwarded in the American press!

How did these intelligence agencies pull it off? Well, let me leave you with a quote from retired Air Force pilot Fletcher Prouty that Michael Collins Piper used to shine some light on this situation. Prouty tells us, “One of the primary necessary measures in an assassination plot is the process of removing or otherwise breaching the intended victim’s blanket of security.” He continues, “No one has to direct an assassination—it happens. The active role is played secretly by permitting it to happen ... This is the single greatest clue—who has the power to call off or reduce the usual security precautions that are always in effect whenever a president travels?”

Now who do you think had the ways, means, and motive to erase President Kennedy’s security that afternoon in Dallas? The Russians? No. The Cubans? No. The Mob? No. I’d place my bets on the CIA! Now are things starting to become clearer?

(As a side-note, who do you think had the ways, means and motivation to cover-up the truth about the 9-11 terrorist attacks in the media - a group of rag-tag terrorists, or the CIA? It’s something to consider.)

THE CIA & ORGANIZED CRIME: TWO SIDES OF THE SAME COIN

Once a researcher strips away the veneer, wades through layers of illusion, disregards years of propaganda & misinformation, and finally sees history in its true perspective, he or she discovers that the entire world-government corporate-controlled global power-structure is actually nothing more than a vast network of interrelated crime syndicates. Yes, CRIME SYNDICATES! In this article, we will briefly examine the Kennedy family’s shadowy past and how certain alliances and betrayals with the Meyer Lansky-led Mob (in conjunction with elements of the U.S. government & CIA) ultimately resulted in JFK’s assassination. As Michael Collins Piper so brilliantly points out, all of these groups—intelligence, govern-

ment, and organized crime—are intimately connected and operate outside the law (and public scrutiny) to preserve and promote their self-interests. Regrettably, they all joined forces in 1963 to eliminate the last American president who wasn't bought, sold, and controlled by the Globalist money interests.

To understand how JFK found himself in such a quandary on November 22, 1963, we must first look back in time at his father, Joseph Sr. As many people know, Old Man Kennedy built his fortune on illegal bootlegging, then by capitalizing on the stock market crash (i.e. inside information). But fewer people realize just how deeply Kennedy was linked with organized crime. To become so incredibly wealthy by running booze, Kennedy had to make agreements with some unseemly characters—agreements that would later come back to haunt him.

Another aspect of Joe Kennedy's personality that his family tries to sweep under the rug was his pro-Nazi sympathies. DeWest Hooker, a New York City executive in the show business field and mentor of George Lincoln Rockwell (founder of the American Nazi Party) said of Kennedy, "Joe admitted that when he was ambassador to England he had been pro-Hitler. However, in Kennedy's words, 'we' lost the war. By 'we' he didn't mean the United States. When Kennedy said 'we,' he meant the non-Jews. Joe Kennedy believed that it was the Jews who had won World War II." He continues, quoting Kennedy. "I've done everything I can to fight the Jewish power over this country. I tried to stop World War II, but I failed. I've made all the money I need and now I'm passing everything I've learned on to my sons."

But before Joe Kennedy got his foot in the political door via an ambassadorship to England, he was a highly successful criminal that made many powerful enemies. One of them was Meyer Lansky, whose associate, Michael Milan, relates the following story in *Final Judgment*. "Ask Meyer Lansky about Joe Kennedy and you'd see one of the few times that Mr. L. would actually get conniptions. What they said back during Prohibition was that you

can't trust Kennedy to keep his word. He stole from his friends so much that he had no friends. And right before World War II, the son of a bitch turned around and said that we should all get on Hitler's side; that the Jews could go to hell."

This enmity between Kennedy and Lansky went all the way back to the 1920's and their bootlegging days. Michael Collins Piper tells us how Lucky Luciano and Lansky swiped an entire shipment of Kennedy's shine and killed off all of his guards, thus causing him to lose a boatload of money. Thus, due to Kennedy's dishonesty and Lansky's fierce loyalty to his Jewish heritage, Milan said that Lansky cursed the entire Kennedy family with revenge; then passed it down to his sons. Things got so bad that Joe Kennedy's life was actually on the line due to a Mob-ordered hit. Luckily for Kennedy, Sam Giancana intervened and cut a deal for Old Man Kennedy to make things right with the Mob again. To return his favor, Kennedy told Giancana that once one of his sons made it into the White House, he'd have an 'in'. To carry through on this promise, though, Old Man Kennedy would once again need Sam Giancana's help.

If this information is hard for you to accept, remember that one of the most famous women that JFK had an affair with (other than Marilyn Monroe) was Miss Judith Exner. And who was she? Sam Giancana's mistress! Also, according to David Heyman in *A Woman Named Jackie*, FBI papers and wiretaps prove that JFK had direct, person-to-person communications with Meyer Lansky during his 1960 presidential campaign. Plus, Sam Giancana himself is quoted as saying, "I help get Jack elected, and in return, he calls off the heat. It'll be business as usual."

As we all know by now, Sam Giancana was the key to JFK beating Richard Nixon in 1960 by giving him Chicago ("vote early, and vote often"). Problems arose, though, when, instead of turning their back on what the mobsters were doing, JFK and his brother Bobby double-crossed them and brought out the heat full-strength.

Now, here's where things get sticky and we need to use some psychology. By all appearances, the Kennedy brothers going after the Mob was one of the stupidest moves of all-time. First, Old Man Kennedy was a bootlegger with intimate ties to organized crime. He knew how the Mob thought and operated.

Plus, he wanted a Kennedy presidential dynasty starting with Jack, followed by Bobby and Teddy. And, with the likes of Sam Giancana behind them, they could rig other elections in the future.

So, with all this in mind, why would Jack and Bobby start trying to throw them all in prison? It seems ludicrous. But y'see, John Kennedy was no dummy—not by a long shot. He knew that the longer his presidency extended, the more demands the Mob would make of him. And, being that the Kennedy family had plenty of skeletons in their closet—Jack's philandering, plus Joe's Nazi sympathies and organized crime ties—JFK knew that he would eventually be bribed and held hostage by the gangsters. If he didn't bow to their wishes, they'd start 'leaking' this information to the press.

And, considering how many people hated Kennedy, if the Mob felt like they weren't getting their fair share of the pie (i.e. government graft) they'd simply dangle Kennedy like a marionette on a string with continued threats of exposure. The entire scenario would have been a disaster for JFK, so Bobby and he decided to get rid of them.

Of course the Mob couldn't overlook Bobby's efforts as the Attorney General, especially since Joe and Giancana had made a pact. Now the Kennedy brothers were reneging, and such a stance could not be tolerated. Or, as Sam Giancana described the situation: "It's a brilliant move on Joe Kennedy's part. He'll have Bobby wipe us out to cover their own dirty tracks and it'll all be done in the Kennedy 'war on organized crime.' Brilliant."

All of this subterfuge was bad enough for Kennedy, but when one adds the Mob's long affiliation with the Central Intelligence

Agency (who also despised Kennedy), you can see how the flames were getting higher.

And although I can't begin to elaborate on the varied ties between these two entities, Michael Collins Piper relates how the United States government began cavorting with Lucky Luciano and the Mafia during WWII, then progressed to Fidel Castro's assassination attempts ("Operation Mongoose" and the ZR/Rifle Team), plus transporting and dealing drugs out of the Golden Triangle while the Vietnam War was being waged.

Sam Giancana described the CIA-Mob ties in very succinct terms. "That's what we are, the Outfit and the CIA—two sides of the same coin."

Some people may wonder why other prominent political figures didn't expose this horrendous situation. They quite possibly could have except for the fact that they were in as deeply as the Kennedy family was. In *Mafia Kingfish* published by McGraw-Hill, John Davis relates how Carlos Marcello funneled over \$50,000 per year in payoffs to Lyndon Baines Johnson, while both James Jesus Angleton and Meyer Lansky had incriminating photographic evidence of J. Edgar Hoover (relating to Hoover's homosexuality).

Thus, he too was bribed into silence. To make matters even more precarious, Michael Collins Piper points out the ADL's links to organized crime and to the highly secretive COINTELPRO, where they gathered intelligence reports on high-ranking officials. These Jewish mobsters who operated through the ADL were the same ones who legitimized and controlled the liquor industry which was run by the Bronfman family.

Now that I've mentioned a Jewish link to organized crime, I might as well delve into one of Michael Collins Piper's biggest contentions in *Final Judgment*—that Meyer Lansky was the "capo di tutti capi"—the undeniable leader of the vast underworld of organized crime—and that the Jews were the ones who actually called the shots while using the Italians as a front to take the heat and divert attention away from them. In this sense, the Jews were the

real brains behind the Mob, while all the other names—Giancana, Trafficante, Marcello, etc—were subordinates of Meyer Lansky.

Hank Messick, in *Lansky*, published by Berkley Medallion Books in 1971, wrote, “The real leaders of crime have remained hidden while the nation’s law enforcement agencies have chased minor punks.” He adds, “Mafia leaders of crime have been hiding behind the vendetta-ridden society [the Italian Mafia] for decades.”

This perception has been reinforced in the public consciousness for years by Hollywood movies and TV shows. It is well-known that the Jews founded Hollywood and still have a huge influence today, perpetrating the Italian mobster stereotype to this day with productions like *The Godfather* and *The Sopranos*. For those who don’t believe that Hollywood was founded by those of Jewish descent, look at the names of its founders:

- Universal Studios – Carl Laemmle – Jewish
- 20th Century Fox – William Fox – Jewish
- Warner Brothers – HM Warner – Jewish
- Paramount Pictures – Adolph Zukor – Jewish
- MGM – Samuel Goldwyn – Jewish
- MGM – Louis B. Mayer – Jewish

Neil Gabler says in *An Empire of Their Own, How the Jews Invented Hollywood* published by Crown in 1988, “The Hollywood Jews created a powerful cluster of images and ideas ... so powerful that, in a sense, they colonized the American imagination. Ultimately, American values came to be defined by the movies the Jews made.” Thus, similar to the tactics used by the Controllers where certain groups or individuals are in the forefront, here too, the Italians became the fall guy while Lansky and his cohorts hid behind the scenes.

As Michael Collins Piper shows, Meyer Lansky came to prominence via his drug running operations, which subsequently brought him into contact with the OSS and Naval Intelligence through an endeavor called “Operation Underworld.” The headquarters for this operation were located at Rockefeller Center in

New York City and were run by William Stephenson, who Ian Fleming patterned his James Bond character after.

Now, what follows is merely a thumbnail sketch of the inter-relatedness between certain Jewish forces, the underworld, and secretive intelligence programs, and I certainly don't do it the justice that Michael Collins Piper does. Anyway, here goes. William Stephenson came to run anti-Nazi operations with the ADL and FBI, and later helped found the Mossad. (The ADL eventually became an intelligence-gathering and propaganda arm for the state of Israel.) Anyway, Stephenson's top man was Louis Bloomfield, who was a lawyer for the Bronfmans (illegal bootlegging and liquor magnates).

Here is where things get wild! Stephenson and Bloomfield were also gun runners for the Jewish underground (in today's vernacular they would be called terrorists), and they were the same people who became the government of Israel! So, once again this reiterates my point that the governments of the world are nothing more than a vast organized crime syndicate. They're all criminals!

Anyway, it was Louis Bloomfield who coordinated the gun-running enterprises at the Jewish Sonneborn Institute. And who helped him? The Bronfmans and Meyer Lansky! Lansky fits specifically into the picture because he set up the banks that were used to launder money for the Mossad.

As a side-note, if you don't think that these types of illegal government operations exist today, check out Mike Ruppert's *The Truth and Lies of 9-11*. Our government and many others still engage in money laundering, gun running, and drug trafficking on a large scale. Plus, if you look into the backgrounds of those people who run the world—the Bronfmans, Kennedys, Rockefellers, Bushes, those who founded Skull & Bones, and many others—you'll discover that they are all criminals. And I don't mean the laughable Richard Nixon-type criminal, but hard-core real-life illegal-type activities.

Anyway, Meyer Lansky became so powerful that Anthony

Summers relates in *Conspiracy* (McGraw-Hill) how, to protect his gambling, prostitution, and drug interests, he convinced the Cuban dictator Fulgencio Batista to temporarily resign in the 1940s.

Apart from his criminal enterprises (and considering his Jewish heritage), Lansky's other undying allegiance was to the state of Israel, to which he made enormous contributions. When he saw how incensed David Ben-Gurion was becoming because of JFK's refusal to assist (or even permit) Israel's nuclear aspirations, his long-standing grudge against the Kennedy family became deadly. And, considering how Old Man Kennedy was a crook, the Controllers felt a huge sense of betrayal when they went to such lengths to get John Kennedy into office, then he turned and tried to destroy their two strongest enforcement and implementation arms—the CIA and the Mob. Someone like Sam Giancana could never forgive Kennedy for pulling a switch on them, especially when Old Man Kennedy sold his soul to spare his life. By reneging on a long-standing deal, then retaliating with destructive force, JFK literally signed his own death warrant. The Controllers were so irate after being double-crossed that they *had* to kill him. And, since Michael Collins Piper asserts that Meyer Lansky was at the head of the organized crime power structure, he, along with the Mossad and James Jesus Angleton of the CIA, were the driving “operational” forces behind Kennedy's assassination.

In the end, Sam Giancana best sums up the hit with these chilling words. “The politicians and the CIA made it real simple. We'd each provide men for the hit. I'd oversee the Outfit [Mafia] side of things and throw in Jack Ruby and some extra backup, and the CIA would put their own guys on to take care of the rest.”

VIETNAM AND THE CIA'S ILLEGAL DRUG TRAFFICKING

Perhaps the biggest secret of the Vietnam War is that our Central Intelligence Agency seized control of the infamous Golden Triangle during that time period, then, with assistance from vari-

ous elements of Organized Crime, shipped huge amounts of heroin out of that area into our country. Because piles of money were being made from this practice and many others, those who stood to profit from this horrendous war—the armament manufacturers, bankers, military men, and drug dealers—met any suggestion to withdraw from Vietnam with immediate consternation.

But that's exactly what John F. Kennedy intended to do upon re-election. In fact, he had already planned on telling the American people that their troops would be back home by 1965. Think about this momentous decision for a moment. If we had exited Vietnam by 1965, eight years of bloodshed in the jungles and civil unrest on America's streets and campuses could have been alleviated.

Michael Collins Piper writes in *Final Judgment*: "Kennedy's intended change in Vietnam policy—his plan to unilaterally withdraw from the imbroglio—infuriated not only the CIA but elements in the Pentagon and their allies in the military-industrial complex. By this time, of course, the Lansky Syndicate had already set up international heroin running from Southeast Asia through the CIA-linked Corsican Mafia in the Mediterranean. The joint Lansky-CIA operations in the international drug racket were a lucrative venture that thrived as a consequence of deep U.S. involvement in Southeast Asia as a cover for drug smuggling activities."

Piper's simple one-paragraph explanation may be the most concise overview of the Vietnam War ever written. The military men and defense contractors were making out like bandits from the War Machine, while the CIA crooks and Lansky-led Mobsters (via Santo Trafficante as the major wheeler-dealer) were likewise padding their pockets. Author Peter Dale Scott, in *Deep Politics and the Death of JFK*, said of this phenomenon, "The flood of drugs into this country since WWII was one of the major 'unspeakable' secrets leading to the ongoing cover-up of the Kennedy assassination."

To provide a broader perspective on this situation, Professor Alfred McCoy stated in *The Politics of Heroin*, "Since the prohibi-

tion of narcotics in 1920, alliances between drug brokers and intelligence agencies have protected the global narcotics traffic. Given the frequency of such alliances, there seems a natural attraction between intelligence agencies and criminal syndicates. Both are practitioners of what one retired CIA operative has called the 'clandestine arts'—the basic skill of operating outside the normal channels of civil society. Among all the institutions of modern society, intelligence agencies and crime syndicates alone maintain large organizations capable of carrying out covert operations without fear of detection."

On the government side, the two main Golden Triangle runners were Ted Schackley and Thomas Clines—the same two men who ran *Operation Mongoose* (the plot to "take out" Fidel Castro). Thus, from 1960-1975, the CIA deployed a secret force of 30,000 Hmong tribesmen to fight the Laotian Communists. They also created heroin labs in this area; then brought it out via their own private airline—Air America.

Alfred McCoy, in *The Politics of Heroin: CIA Complicity in the Global Drug Trade*, describes how the CIA first gave smack to our own American soldiers in Vietnam before shipping it into the United States, where Lansky mobsters dealt it on the streets.

Sam Giancana's biographers reinforced this point by stating that while organized crime did its thing, "The CIA looked the other way—allowing over \$100 million a year in illicit drugs to flow through Havana into the U.S. It was an arrangement similar to all the rest they'd made. The CIA received 10% of the take on the side of narcotics, which they utilized for their undercover slush fund."

After the Mob and the CIA generated this dirty money, they laundered it into secret bank accounts controlled by the international bankers. That way, the government couldn't get their hands on it and the funds could be invested in the stock market, loaned out to other businesses on the take, or channeled into Secret Service black budgets.

So, even though the above information is only the tip of the

iceberg, now do you see why it was so important to the CIA/Mobster/international banking cabal that JFK didn't pull America out of Vietnam? The money (via illegal drug trafficking and for the War Machine) was incredible, while control of another area of the globe (the Golden Triangle) was secured.

As a final note, only four days after John Kennedy was assassinated, Lyndon Baines Johnson, his successor, put his name on NSAM 273, which secured our increased involvement in Southeast Asia. These guys weren't wasting any time! Within a few short months, our involvement in Vietnam went from 20,000 troops to a quarter of a million! The CIA had won, and ten years later 57,000 American soldiers were dead—truly shocking and abysmal behavior—an embarrassment and blight on the American conscience.

MEDIA COMPLICIT IN THE KENNEDY ASSASSINATION

As I conclude this review of Michael Collins Piper's *Final Judgment*, the last piece of the puzzle that we need to examine is the media's role in covering up JFK's execution on November 22, 1963. As we've seen in earlier pieces, the organization with the greatest ways, means, and motive to pull-off this heinous act was the CIA, with direct assistance from the Mossad and Meyer Lansky's international crime syndicate. To further indict the spooks at Langley, all one has to do is investigate how extensively they have infiltrated the American media during the latter half of the 20th century. And if anyone hollers 'conspiracy theory' over these accusations, please remember this adage: something is no longer a theory once it has been proven to be true. Pulitzer Prize-winning journalist Carl Bernstein supports this point in his famous October 20, 1977 article for *Rolling Stone* when he wrote about how 400 CIA-funded journalists had infiltrated the American media under "Operation Mockingbird." He wrote: "[Joseph] Alsop is one of more than 400 American journalists who in the past 25 years have secretly carried out assignments

for the CIA—ACCORDING TO DOCUMENTS ON FILE AT CIA HEADQUARTERS!” Also, in the 1950’s and 60’s, CBS News was nicknamed the “CIA Broadcasting System.”

So, we need to ask ourselves, who had the resources and ability to implement the final step of this carefully-crafted assassination? The answer is provided by Jerry Pollicoff in *Government by Gunplay* (Signet Books). “The Kennedy assassination cover-up has survived so long only because the press—confronted with the choice of believing what it was told or examining the facts independently—chose the former.”

To keep the people of this country confused, the media pushed every theory imaginable—except that of Israeli involvement. As filmmaker Oliver Stone told *The New York Times* on December 20, 1991, “When a leader of any country is assassinated, the media normally ask: what political forces were opposed to this leader and would benefit from his assassination?”

But as Michael Collins Piper points out in *Final Judgment*, Oliver Stone failed to pursue the Israeli angle, possibly because the executive producer of his *JFK* movie was a man named Arnon Milchan, who Alexander Cockburn said in *The Nation* magazine on May 18, 1992 was “probably Israel’s largest arms dealer.” In addition, Benjamin Beit-Hallahmi called Milchan a “Mossad Man.”

What our media was essentially called upon to do was:

- 1) Forward and support the Warren Commission’s findings
- 2) Perpetuate the “lone nut” theory
- 3) Attack dissenters
- 4) Prevent any discussion of Israeli involvement

As Michael Collins Piper shows, at the center of this cover-up was WDSU media, which was operated by the Stern family who were major league contributors to the ADL. Working in conjunction with this news outlet and the major networks was CIA mastermind James Jesus Angleton. These forces were at the center of a conspiracy to feed the media false leads (misinformation),

and to steer any investigation away from the true impetus of the Kennedy assassination.

Quite possibly the most important factor that was ignored by the media was an entity named Permindex that acted as the point of convergence for the CIA, Mossad, and the Lansky Mob. Who, you may ask, was Permindex? Well, Permindex was a weapons supplier located in Rome that also laundered money and had ties to the CIA, Meyer Lansky, and the state of Israel.

Although I won't be able to delve into this topic as thoroughly as Michael Collins Piper did in *Final Judgment*, below is a brief overview of this entity's role in the Kennedy assassination. The Chairman of the Board of Permindex was Major Louis M. Bloomfield (previously mentioned in this series) who was one of the two primary figures in establishing both the Mossad and the state of Israel. Bloomfield also held half the shares in Permindex, was employed by J. Edgar Hoover in the FBI's infamous "Division Five," and became a front man for the powerful Bronfman family. The Bronfmans, you must remember, were bootleggers (like Joe Kennedy), who built their empire via the Lansky crime syndicate.

One of the other chief shareholders in Permindex was Tibor Rosenbaum, who established in Geneva an entity called BCI (Banque de Credit International). Rosenbaum was also the Director of Finance & Supply for the Mossad, while his BCI was the main money laundering arm for Meyer Lansky. Finally, BCI was intimately connected with the Mossad, while its founder, Tibor Rosenbaum, was called the "Godfather" of the Israeli nation.

Now, when we consider how crucial the state of Israel was to people like David Ben-Gurion and the above listed men and how threatened they felt in regard to its very survival, it becomes more than coincidental that all these forces (the Mossad, CIA, and Lansky's Mob) converged around Permindex. Each had direct ties to this entity, and each had their own reasons as to why they wanted Kennedy dead.

Yet what angle did the American media pursue? The lone-nut

theory where a stumblebum like Lee Harvey Oswald pulled off the biggest coup of the 20th century! It's beyond incredible.

Then, to cover their tracks and eliminate their "patsy" (who was obviously going to start singing), the conspirators brought in Jack Ruby to kill Oswald. But again the media failed in their duties to tell the truth. Rather than simply being a "grieving American" who felt compelled to kill Oswald to spare Jackie Kennedy any further heartache, Jack Ruby (real last name: Rubinstein) was a member of Meyer Lansky's Jewish Mob! Why didn't *Time* magazine let us in on this little tidbit of information?

Or, why hasn't journalist John Henshaw's "lost" film footage been released where Jack Ruby is led by Justice Department officials through Dallas police headquarters past the screeners, FBI agents, and detectives who were supposed to secure the premises? This is PRIME EVIDENCE! Why hasn't it ever been brought to the public's attention?

Even more peculiar is Judge Earl Warren's decision to not let Jack Ruby testify before his Commission. Why? Maybe it had something to do with the fact that the Warren Commission was stacked with members of the Council on Foreign Relations, a Bilderberg attendee (Gerald Ford, who was later rewarded with the Presidency after Nixon was taken down), and Allen Dulles, who was fired by JFK! Think about how absurd this situation is. John Kennedy fired CIA Director Allen Dulles and threatened to shatter his organization into a thousand pieces and scatter it to the wind. Yet what happened? Allen Dulles was appointed to the Warren Commission to 'investigate' the murder of the man who fired him. Dulles's organization was integral in the assassination.

Researcher Dorothy Kilgallen told the *Philadelphia News* on February 22, 1964, "One of the best kept secrets of the Ruby trial is the extent to which the federal government is cooperating with the defense. The unprecedented alliance between Ruby's lawyers and the Department of Justice in Washington may provide the case with the one dramatic element it has lacked: Mystery."

There are countless other peculiarities that the media could have exposed, such as how the Kennedys had future, large-scale plans to undermine the Rothschild-controlled Federal Reserve and how it had a stranglehold on the American economy and money system, but instead they were content to sell their souls and say that the entire debacle was carried out by a lone-nut assassin—Lee Harvey Oswald. And to this day, even though the Church Committee found in the 1970's that a conspiracy to kill President Kennedy existed and that our government was involved, the media and our public schools continue to advance the lone-nut theory. Amazing.

But Michael Collins Piper goes further ... much further ... listing the ACTUAL NAMES of those who were responsible for John F. Kennedy's assassination—the primary planners who had first-hand knowledge of the murder, plus the secondary players and those on the periphery. I strongly urge all of you to purchase this book and find out for yourselves who was behind this grisly act. Once you dive inside *Final Judgment* you'll see the roles each of the below entities played:

The Mossad – the blackened heart

The CIA – the demented mind

The Lansky Mob – the muscle

The American media – the blind eyes & muted mouth

Herve Lamarr, in *Farewell America*, sums up the situation as such: “President Kennedy's assassination was the work of magicians. It was a stage trick, complete with accessories and false mirrors, and when the curtain fell, the actors, and even the scenery, disappeared. But the magicians were not illusionists but professionals, artists in their way.”

That's an incredible difference from a disillusioned “lone nut” assassin who pulled off this grandiose act all by himself. And if you think this horrendous situation has changed even one iota in the last forty years, you're sadly mistaken. To prove this point, I'll close

with this excerpt from an interview with Greg Palast in *Hustler* magazine. It concerns the premier cover-up artist Dan Rather, whose entire career was made off the Kennedy assassination.

Palast: I feel sick at heart when I see Rather because he's actually a journalist. He came on my program, *Newsnight*, in England and said, 'I can't report the news. I'm not allowed to ask questions. We're gonna send our children and our husbands into the desert now and I can't ask a question because I will be lynched.' He looked defeated and awful, and I was thinking ... why am I feeling sorry for this guy who is worth millions? He should turn to the camera and say, 'Well, now for the truth. Over to you, Greg, in London.' The problem is that he can't report the story of the intelligence agents who are told not to look at the bin Laden family, not to look at Saudi funding of terror.

***Hustler:* What makes Rather afraid to do his job?**

Palast: It's not just that there are brutal shepherds like Rupert Murdoch out there to beat the dickens out of any reporter that asks the wrong questions; its all about making news on the cheap ... to some extent they know that there are certain things you cannot say. Rather says he would be necklaced for telling the truth.

Regrettably, the cover-up that took place with the Kennedy assassination forty years ago is exactly the same as it is today with the 9-11 cover-up. As yesterday, as today.

CHAPTER TWENTY-ONE

Michael Collins Piper's

The High Priests of War

May 17, 2004

Victor Thorn

After reading *Final Judgment*, I jokingly commented to an acquaintance, "Michael Collins Piper has ruined any further JFK research on my part because, compared to his book, everything else seems like child's play." Well, the same rationale now applies to the mainstream media's coverage of the men who are orchestrating our war in Iraq. In contrast to what Michael Collins Piper has accomplished in his latest work, *The High Priests of War*, our corporate newsmen resemble an emasculated band of poseurs who can't (or won't) tell the American people what's actually taking place within the corridors of power in our nation's capital.

Beginning with a brief overview of the Cold War fraud which was played out in great detail and with great drama on the world stage, Piper shows us how a small but tightly-linked cabal of "neo-conservatives" rose from Trotsky's shadow to become adherents of Senator Henry "Scoop" Jackson (a Democrat, by the way); then moved into the Reagan and Bush Sr. administrations, where they were largely viewed as "crazies" that had to be contained. Along the way, we also discover how these twisted intellectuals are intricately tied to an underlying Zionist cause, and how they're able to promote their aims via a well-established network of media outlets, think tanks, and politicians who had sold their souls long ago.

Piper's greatest strength, though, lies in his ability to expose and interconnect those furtive elements that others shy away from, such as Richard Perle and William Kristol's role in contriving our current war, their links to the Bilderbergs and CFR, and

how a little known group—Team B—has hijacked the foreign policy arm of the Republican Party. But the author doesn't stop there, for he carefully lists all of the people and organizations involved in this nefarious Kosher Nostra.

Of particular interest are two quotes contained within this book that truly convey where the loyalties lie for some of our Washingtonian power-brokers. One was provided by Arizona Senator John McCain (in regard to Israel's survival), while the other was uttered by ex-CIA analyst George Friedman in relation to who most benefited from the 9-11 terrorist attacks. Needless to say, these passages are very eye-opening, and reveal the type of forces we're up against.

On a final note, Michael Collins Piper must be credited for addressing quite possibly the most important aspect of the neo-con phenomenon: how the United States of America is being used as a pawn to do the dirty work for a group of Globalists in their quest for a centrally-governed international empire. In this sense, what we see on the nightly news or read in our daily newspapers isn't the full-story, for a secret agenda is at hand, one that is systematically being implemented to manipulate and weaken our country until it eventually folds into the elitists' vision of a New World Order. This book is a must read for those who feel the media pundits and talking heads aren't playing it straight with us.

CHAPTER TWENTY-TWO

Michael Collins Piper's

The New Jerusalem

August 31, 2005

Victor Thorn

Some words burn with the fury of boric acid through steel. This statement certainly applies to a quote which Michael Collins Piper uses near the end of *The New Jerusalem* from former president Harry S. Truman's unpublished diary: "The Jews have no sense of proportion, nor do they have any judgment on world affairs. The Jews, I find, are very, very selfish. They care not how many Estonians, Latvians, Finns, Poles, Yugoslavs, or Greeks are murdered or mistreated as [post-war] Displaced Persons as long as the Jews get special treatment. Yet when they have power—physical, financial or political—neither Hitler nor Stalin had anything on them for cruelty or mistreatment to the underdog."

These words carry as much power and poignancy as anything ever written in the annals of history; but as Piper points out, Truman wasn't the only president to feel such resentment toward the Jews. Of course we're all familiar with Richard Nixon's views (he once called financier Robert Vesco a "cheap kike" and determined that "the IRS is full of Jews"). But how many people were aware of Jimmy Carter's re-election hopes in 1980: "If I get back in, I'm going to f--- the Jews." Likewise, George Bush Senior's Secretary of State, James Baker, had this to say (long before the neo-cons rose to power): "F--- the Jews. They don't vote for us anyway."

Harry S. Truman's assertions on Jews and world affairs ring even truer today, for Piper opens *The New Jerusalem* by showing how the two most pivotal events of our still-young 21st century—9-11 and the Iraqi War—are both unequivocally based upon U.S. policy in the Middle East.

In regard to 9-11, if you're naïve enough to still believe the government's "official" version of events—that 19 Arab cave-dwellers planned, orchestrated, and executed the September 11 terror attacks—you can't deny that it would have been caused by America's molly-coddling relationship with the terrorist nation of Israel. But as we know, 9-11 was actually an inside job perpetrated by a small cabal within (and outside) our government. And why would they perpetrate such a psychopathically bloodthirsty mass murder? Answer: because it served as a pretext for our war in the Middle East where the United States is nothing more than a proxy doing Israel's dirty work. So, in this sense, Piper's claim is absolutely correct.

In a similar vein, Piper refers to a book by Benjamin Ginsberg entitled *The Fatal Embrace: Jews and the State*. As the title implies, Jews have always had a historic 'embrace' of the State because, in pure Machiavellian terms, that's been their means to arrive at the ultimate goal—power. This embrace, though, oftentimes proves fatal, for regardless of where the Jews have resided—since biblical times—they have been enslaved, driven out, or killed en masse. Everywhere!

Again, you may wonder why. Surprisingly, the answer is simple. Throughout the ages, Jews have manipulated the 'system' to gain great wealth and power. And although Jews today only constitute 2% of America's population, they unite with other like-minded individuals to create an array of very potent organizations and lobbies that ultimately seek not only political power, but also social influence as well (i.e. Hollywood, TV, etc).

This arrogance is conveyed quite vividly by Mr. Ginsberg. "Jews often, secretly or not so secretly, conceive themselves to be morally and intellectually superior to their neighbors."

Thus, the Jews inevitably begin to abuse their power, and are eventually exposed and dealt with in the methods described above. Does this same fate await the neo-cons of today, along with the multi-tentacled Zionist lobby, the corrupt media kingpins,

Ariel Sharon's genocidal regime, and those who are building an Apartheid Wall from the West Bank's northern-most point to Jerusalem? If the past is any indicator, history will not treat these "enemies of the people" kindly.

One of the unfortunate results of this arrogant pursuit of power is clear—war. And as Michael Collins Piper explains, three-quarters of America's foreign aid expenditures is geared toward (either directly or indirectly) Israel's safety. Thus, not only do we surrender \$10 billion to Israel every year, but our annual outlays to Egypt are primarily administered for one reason—so that they won't attack Israel. Isn't it clear what a vicious cycle has been created by our subservience to Israel, and what a vulnerable position it puts us in as a nation?

Worse, our current debacle in Iraq isn't the first war engineered by Jewish elitists. Anyone who cares to objectively study history will discover the same hidden hands behind the Civil War (where Rothschild interests financed both the North and the South), as well as the Bolshevik Revolution, World War I, World War II, and the first "Desert Storm" Iraq War.

To his credit, Piper illustrates how this pattern exists today with our Orwellian 'war on terror.' Many people do not understand this key point: President George W. Bush is not the one calling the shots. Rather, the New World Order controllers have yet again dispatched a host of agents to do their bidding (in the same vein as Colonel Edward Mandel House & Woodrow Wilson, Henry Kissinger, Zbigniew Brzezinski, and Samuel P. Huntington). This time the provocateur is Natan Sharansky, who has joined forces with other neo-cons mentioned in Piper's previous book, *The High Priests of War* (Wolfowitz, William Kristol, and Richard Perle ('the Prince of Darkness'), etc).

Piper writes, "The Bush agenda (rather the agenda of Bush's Zionist handlers) is no more than a modernized brand of old-style Bolshevism inspired by the late Leon Trotsky."

And although the detrimental effects of such an infiltration

are obvious (especially in regard to foreign policy), criticism of Israel brings swift and vengeful retaliation in certain circles. In fact, one of the most riveting elements of Piper's book is his concise analysis of the Zionist community at large, who charge that any criticism of Israel makes one not only anti-Semitic and anti-Israel, but also anti-American and anti-Christian, because (at least in their eyes) Israel's goals and America's goals should be one and the same. Such a philosophy, though, is nothing new, for it extends back many generations to a time when families such as the Rosenwalds, Friedsams, Blumenthals, Schiffs, Warburgs, Lehmans, Baruchs, Bronfmans, and Guggenheims rose to prominence. These individuals, and the representatives and organizations they spawned, eventually became what Ferdinand Lundberg called "the de facto government" which "is actually the government of the United States—informal, invisible, shadowy" (*America's Sixty Families*).

Strangely, the above subjects are rarely discussed on Sunday morning talk shows or on the the opinion page of major daily newspapers. It seems as if we can intellectually debate virtually any subject in this country—abortion, gun control, taxation, outsourcing to China, the oil policies of Hugo Chavez, Russia's views on the West, or AIDS in Africa; but anyone who criticizes (or even discusses) how the Jewish lobby's treasure chest influences U.S. lawmakers is instantly labeled an anti-Semite.

Needless to say, Piper's *The New Jerusalem* is an invaluable resource for any person who wants to clearly see how this country (and the world at large) is being manipulated by a hidden (and not-so-hidden) Zionist power. Plus, in addition to the topics already mentioned, the author also delves into the Zionist connections to Enron, the Inslaw Affair and PROMIS software, the Bronfman crime family's relationship to John McCain, media control (especially at the late Katharine Graham's *Washington Post*), how corporate journalists were compromised via Operation Mockingbird, the possibility of there being another "Deep Throat,"

Donald Trump, and a who's who of the Jewish elite. Historically, Piper also touches upon the Holocaust Industry and how it is exploited by those who constantly seek the role of victim, Jewish control of the trans-Atlantic slave trade from Africa, the murder of author/researcher Danny Casolaro by a sub-unit of the Department of Justice's OSI (Office of Special Investigations), and a continuation of *Final Judgment's* analysis of Meyer Lansky's underworld Mafia ties and his role in key 20th-century events.

Once you read this book, I guarantee you'll never see the world around you in the same light again.



AUTHOR'S BIOGRAPHY

MICHAEL COLLINS PIPER

For some 25 years, acting through independent American media outlets, Michael Collins Piper has been one of the most outspoken, prolific and widely-read American journalists to take a consistent stance against unquestioning U.S. support for Israel, criticizing U.S. policy that has injured American relations with the Arab and Muslim worlds. Not surprisingly, Piper has frequently been the target of published attacks by the Anti-Defamation League (ADL) of B'nai B'rith, the Simon Wiesenthal Center, and the Middle East Media Research Institute (MEMRI), among other Israeli lobby factions in the United States.

Piper's book, *Final Judgment: The Missing Link in the JFK Assassination Conspiracy*—which documents multiple connections by Israel's intelligence agency, the Mossad, to the murder of President John F. Kennedy—has been harshly attacked by the Israeli lobby, but has emerged as one of the most convincing and enthusiastically received volumes ever written on the topic. In 1991 the distinguished Beirut-based firm of Dar El Ilm Lilmalayin published the first-ever Arabic-language translation of *Final Judgment*. In 2004 the book was released in an English-language edition in Malaysia and is also being published in the Malay language and in Japanese. Piper's other books, *The High Priests of War*, a study of the pro-Israel neo-conservative network that orchestrated the American war against Iraq, and *The New Jerusalem*, a comprehensive, up-to-date overview of the wealth and power of the Zionist community in America, have received widespread distribution both here and abroad and have been published in Malaysia in both English and Malay. *The High Priests of War* is scheduled for publication in Arabic.

PERSONAL-EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND

Born in Pennsylvania, USA, July 16, 1960. Son of Thomas M. Piper (deceased) and Gloria Armstrong Piper (deceased). Received B.A. in political science. Attended one year of legal studies. Piper is of German, Irish, Dutch and American Indian descent. He is a great-great-grandson of famed bridge builder “Colonel” John L. Piper, an early business partner and father figure of American industrial giant, Andrew Carnegie. Although Piper has no children of his own, he is the proud godfather of two boys, one of whom is an African-American and the other of whom is a Japanese-American. Piper is a renowned lover of animals and an outspoken critic of brutal, inhumane Kosher slaughter practices.

PROFESSIONAL

- In 1979, as a student, served as an intern on the national campaign staff of the John Connally for President Committee. The former Governor of Texas and Treasury Secretary under President Richard M. Nixon, Connally—who was wounded during the assassination of President John F. Kennedy in Dallas in 1963—was forced to withdraw from the presidential race after his outspoken critique of U.S. favoritism toward Israel and bias against the Arab world resulted in widespread attacks in the American media.

- Starting part time in 1980 as a student and then full time in 1983, began working for Liberty Lobby, a Washington, D.C.-based citizens lobby that was a longtime #1 target of the Anti-Defamation League (ADL) of B’nai B’rith because of Liberty Lobby’s criticism of U.S. favoritism toward Israel. Remained in employment with Liberty Lobby and its weekly newspaper, *The Spotlight*, until June 27, 2001, at which time Liberty Lobby closed its doors. Note: although Liberty Lobby had been a successfully flourishing entity, the institution was forced into bankruptcy following a civil lawsuit.

- On July 16, 2001 Piper joined former Liberty Lobby employees and others in launching a new national weekly newspaper,

American Free Press, which has some 50,000 weekly readers nationwide. Serves as a regular weekly correspondent for the newspaper and is actively engaged in its direct mail fundraising and subscription-enhancing programs, writing promotional letters, book and video advertising materials and preparing numerous special projects. Has served as treasurer and executive board member of the corporation that publishes *American Free Press*.

- In Sept. 1994, Piper was involved in launching the then-monthly (now bi-monthly) historical magazine, *The Barnes Review*, which has been continuously published since that time. Serves as a Contributing Editor and has served on the board of directors of the Foundation for Economic Liberty, the corporation which publishes *The Barnes Review*. The magazine has some 9,000 paid subscribers (including many worldwide). Until his recent death, Dr. Issa Nakleh, longtime representative at the United Nations for the Arab Higher Committee for Palestine, served alongside Piper on the editorial board of *The Barnes Review*. Over the past several years, Dr. Nakleh cited numerous writings by Piper in various letters, press releases and other documents issued in furtherance of the Palestinian cause.

WRITINGS, LECTURES, RADIO APPEARANCES

- Over some 25 years, Piper has written an estimated 4,000 news articles and feature stories for *The Spotlight* and now *American Free Press*, not to mention dozens of feature articles for *The Barnes Review* magazine. Many of the articles have focused on the activities and influence of the Israel lobby in the United States and related subjects, although his work has also encompassed a wide variety of affairs, including U.S. Congressional legislation, organized crime, political history, freedom of speech and expression, American media bias and censorship, etc. His work has also appeared in *Zeitenschrift*, published in Switzerland and in *The European* magazine

- Piper has been the guest on an estimated 100 different

radio talk programs and has appeared as an invited speaker at dozens of public forums, often as the featured speaker. He has also lectured before both high school and college classes where his lectures have been very well received.

- In January of 2002, Piper was among the speakers at the First International Conference on Global Problems of World History, held at the Humanitarian Social Academy in Moscow, Russia under the auspices of Dr. Oleg Platonov and the board of editors of *The Encyclopedia of Russian Civilization* and *The Barnes Review*.

- On March 11, 2003 Piper was the featured lecturer at the Zayed Centre for Coordination and Follow-Up in Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates, at which time he discussed the role of the Zionist lobby in influencing U.S. media coverage of the Palestinian problem and the Arab-Israeli conflict. Piper's lecture was reported in a number of English-language and Arabic-language publications including *Gulf News*, *Khaleeq Times*, and *Al-Wahda*. Subsequent to this, the Zayed Centre released a published report of Piper's lecture in both English and Arabic. During his visit, Piper also had the honor of being received for an extended audience by UAE Deputy Prime Minister, Sheik Sultan bin Zayed al Nahyan, at his palace in Abu Dhabi. Piper's lecture (along with certain other lectures) created a great stir among Israeli lobby organizations such as the Anti-Defamation League (ADL) and the Middle East Media Research Institute (MEMRI), to the point that these organizations highlighted Piper's lecture in numerous press releases and in complaints to the Bush administration, resulting in pressure from the administration upon the government of Abu Dhabi which, under fire, pulled funding for the Zayed Centre. *Some 10,000 reprints of Piper's speech in Abu Dhabi have been distributed in the United States and worldwide and it has been reprinted in many locations on the Internet.*

- In August of 2004, Piper was invited to Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia where his books *Final Judgment* and *The High Priests of*

War were released in English-language editions. While in Malaysia, Piper spoke at multiple venues to widespread acclaim.

- In November of 2004, Piper was invited to Tokyo, Japan where he spoke under the auspices of prominent Japanese nationalist Dr. Ryu Ohta who translated an abbreviated version of Piper's book, *The High Priests of War*, into Japanese. In addition, a Japanese translation of Piper's book, *Final Judgment*, is underway.

- In late 2004 and early 2005, Piper spoke at multiple venues across Canada, ranging from Toronto in the East to Vancouver in the West, under the auspices of the Canadian Association for Free Expression.

- On June 23, 1986, writing in *The Spotlight*, Piper was the first journalist ever to identify Roy Bullock of San Francisco, California as a longtime undercover informant for the Anti-Defamation League (ADL) of B'nai B'rith. Although Bullock denied the charge and threatened Piper with a libel suit, the truth about Bullock's ADL activities was officially unmasked in a widely-publicized FBI and San Francisco Police Department inquiry into the ADL in late 1992—more than seven years after Piper first correctly linked Bullock to the ADL. Bullock later acknowledged that Piper's *Spotlight* article set in motion the events that led to the FBI inquiry and the resulting scandal that tarred the ADL's public image.

Later, Piper edited and wrote the introductory material to a book describing the ADL scandal entitled: *The Garbage Man: The Strange World of Roy Edward Bullock*, which incorporated official FBI and police documents outlining the ADL's spy activity aimed against Arab-Americans and others targeted by the Israeli lobby.

When former Rep. Paul N. (Pete) McCloskey (R-Calif.) initiated legal action against the ADL on behalf of individuals who had been targeted by the ADL, Piper provided—at McCloskey's request—research material used by McCloskey in the course of his lawsuit. The lawsuit was recently settled by the ADL, which paid damages to its victims.

FINAL JUDGMENT—HOTLY CONTROVERSIAL

Piper's book, *Final Judgment: The Missing Link in the JFK Assassination Conspiracy*, was first published in 1994. Some 35,000 copies of the 768-page book (now in an expanded, updated sixth edition, featuring more than 1,000 footnotes) are now in circulation.

The book features an introduction by Dr. Robert L. Brock, a veteran African-American political activist. As noted previously, an Arabic-language edition was released in 2001 by a major Arabic-language publishing house, although to Piper's disappointment, the firm does not seem to have made major efforts to promote it, according to Piper's sources in the Middle East. However, in the United States, *Final Judgment* has been hotly controversial and has been the subject of much controversy.

- In September, 1997, an intended lecture by Piper at the Saddleback College in Orange County, California—dedicated to the subject of the book—was disrupted and canceled following a heavy-handed pressure campaign by the ADL. The furor resulted in a front-page story in *The LA Times* and in wire service articles published across America. Despite the controversy, the staff of the Saddleback College newspaper defied the ADL pressure group and invited Piper to lecture privately to the newspaper staff.

- In the early months of 2000, the book *Final Judgment* again stimulated widespread public controversy in the Chicago, Illinois metropolitan area when the ADL unsuccessfully attempted to prevent by the book from being placed in the Schaumburg, Illinois Public Library, one of the most distinguished library systems in the state. In May 2001, Piper appeared in person at the library and gave a lecture on the book and the surrounding controversy to some 200 persons in attendance. The affair was publicized in numerous publications in the Chicago area and was nationally referenced in the journal of the American Library Association.

- *Final Judgment* has been publicly endorsed by not only a

former high-ranking U.S. State Department official (whose enthusiastic review of the book was self-published by the diplomat on amazon.com) but also by a former high-ranking Pentagon official, a well-known Hollywood screen-writer, a respected American foundation official and widely-published author and others.

- *Final Judgment* was reprinted in its expanded sixth edition in early 2004 (and in a slightly revised and updated second printing of the sixth edition in 2005) and some 5,000 additional copies have been sold, with many buyers buying as many as 16 copies (via bulk carton) at a time. During the short period when the volume was temporarily out-of-print, second-hand editions of the book were selling (in paperback) on the Internet for as much as \$185 per copy, demonstrating the demand for this hotly controversial “underground best-seller.”

THE HIGH PRIESTS OF WAR **THE NEO-CONSERVATIVE WAR-MONGERS**

- Michael Collins Piper’s book, *The High Priests of War*, published in 2003, has sold more than 20,000 copies and has been favorably reviewed in a number of Internet-based outlets. The book is an examination of “The secret history of how America’s [pro-Israel] ‘neo-conservative’ Trotskyites came to power and orchestrated the war against Iraq as the first step in their drive for global empire.”

The book, which is 128 pages in length, including a detailed photo section, has been published in Malaysia in both English and Malay and is being published in Arabic by a leading publishing house in Saudi Arabia. An abbreviated edition has also been published in Japanese.

THE NEW JERUSALEM: ZIONIST POWER IN AMERICA

- *The New Jerusalem*—a 184-page study of Zionist power in America, including an extended profile of the Bronfman family, capsule summaries of the names and details regarding 200 of the most powerful Zionist families in America, and wide-ranging citations (from exclusively Zionist sources) about the extent of Zionist influence in American politics, government, the media, finance and culture. This book has been published in both English and Malay in Malaysia.

- **Piper has also written introductions to the following published books:**

- *Out of Debt, Out of Danger*, by the late former U.S. Congressman Jerry Voorhis (a critical study of the U.S. Federal Reserve System);

- *The Third Rome: Holy Russia, Tsarism & Orthodoxy*, by Dr. M. Raphael Johnson, a history of Czarist Russia;

- *A Primer on Money*, by the late former U.S. Congressman Wright Patman (D-Texas)—another critical study of the U.S. Federal Reserve System); and

- *The Passion Play of Oberammergau* — a reprint of the late W. T. Stead's famed account of the Christian presentation of the Passion of Christ presented every ten years in Oberammergau, Germany.

MICHAEL COLLINS PIPER may be contacted at:

PO Box 15728

Washington, DC 20003

Email: piperml@lycos.com

Messages may be left for Piper at the Washington, D.C. office of *American Free Press* at (202) 544-5977.

THE EDITORS

Victor Thorn & Lisa Guliani

Victor Thorn and Lisa Guliani are the co-hosts of WING TV, a daily online television talk show which is taped every Monday through Friday, and can be seen at: www.wingtv.net. They also hosted a radio show on the Reality Radio Network from 2002-2003, and are currently doing a one-hour weekly news update radio segment on Alex Merklinger's *Mysteries of the Mind*. Thorn is also the founder of Sisyphus Press.

Thorn and Guliani have also authored the following books:

- The New World Order Exposed
- The New World Order Illusion
- America Before the Fall
- 9-11 on Trial
- 9-11 Exposed
- Eden and Atlantis
- Hunters of Souls
- The OKC Bombing-Elohim City Connection
- WING TV 9-11 Collection (two-disc set on CD-ROM)
- The Real Reason Jesus Was Crucified
- Christ Killers: A Scholarly Study of Jewish Deicide
- The Mike Gallagher Chronicles


FINAL JUDGMENT

The Missing Link in the JFK Assassination Conspiracy

BY MICHAEL COLLINS PIPER

This massive 768-page volume is just now back from the printer in the second printing of its Sixth Edition, containing explosive new material.

More than 45,000 copies of previous edition of this book are in circulation here and around the world, documenting—just as Israeli nuclear whistle-blower Mordechai Vanunu has said—that JFK's obstinate efforts to prevent Israel from building nuclear weapons of mass destruction played a critical role in the conspiracy behind JFK's assassination. On the strength of this amazing book, Piper has been invited all over the world to discuss his findings—everywhere from the Arab world to Moscow to Malaysia and Japan. Find out what the rest of the world knows about JFK's assassination and what the Controlled Media wants to keep under wraps. This is definitively the last word on the subject, endorsed by former high-ranking Pentagon and State Department officials and endless numbers of independent researchers who aren't afraid to utter the dreaded word . . . Mossad. *Final Judgment*, softcover, 768 pages, 1,000+ footnotes, \$25.




Order from FIRST AMENDMENT BOOKS, 645 Pennsylvania Avenue SE, Suite 100, Washington, D.C. 20003. No charge for shipping & handling inside the United States. Call 1-888-699-NEWS (6397) toll free to charge to Visa or MasterCard.

THE HIGH PRIESTS OF WAR

The Secret History of How America's Neo-Conservative Trotskyites Came to Power and Orchestrated the War in Iraq as the First Step in Their Drive for Global Empire

BY MICHAEL COLLINS PIPER

The secret history of how America's "neo-conservative" Trotskyites came to power and orchestrated the war against Iraq as the first step in their drive for Global Empire, the so-called New World Order. This is the only full-length book on the "neo-cons" that tells the entire story—no holds barred. The book is now being circulated internationally and is being translated into a variety of languages, acclaimed as the one book that explains the "who, what, when, where, why and how" of the tragic involvement of the United States in the Iraq war. This fast-reading, carefully-documented 144-page volume has helped spread the word about the REAL reason for the Iraq war and how it is all part of a grand design that is being suppressed by the Controlled Media. Large photo section shows who these neo-cons are and the role they play in the plot. *The High Priests of War*, softcover, 144 pages, \$19.95.




Order from FIRST AMENDMENT BOOKS, 645 Pennsylvania Avenue SE, Suite 100, Washington, D.C. 20003. No charge for shipping & handling inside the United States. Call 1-888-699-NEWS (6397) toll free to charge to Visa or MasterCard.

THE NEW JERUSALEM

Zionist Power in America

BY MICHAEL COLLINS PIPER

Unlike anything ever published in the modern day, this explosive study combines in 184 pages, for the first time ever between two covers, all of the amazing facts and figures which document the massive accumulation of wealth and power by those who have used that influence to direct the course of U.S. foreign and domestic policy today. While there are many historical books on "the Israeli lobby" and about Zionist intrigues, etc, this is the only book that brings things "up to date" and constitutes a bold and thorough inquiry. Chapters include a list of prominent figures throughout history accused of "anti-Zionism" and "anti-Semitism," a detailed dissection of the Bronfman family, who are often called "the Royal family of American Zionism," an eye-opening summary of some 200 little-known, immensely wealthy Zionist families in America; a fascinating inquiry in to the infamous Enron and INSLAW affairs, documenting the suppressed "Zionist connection" plus more. *The New Jerusalem*, softcover, 176 pages, \$19.95.



Order from FIRST AMENDMENT BOOKS, 645 Pennsylvania Avenue SE, Suite 100, Washington, D.C. 20003. No charge for shipping & handling inside the United States. Call 1-888-699-NEWS (6397) toll free to charge to Visa or MasterCard.

DIRTY SECRETS


Crime, Corruption & Cover-Up in the 20th Century

Based on the Writings and Interviews of Michael Collins Piper

Compiled and Edited by Victor Thorn & Lisa Guliani

Mordechai Vanunu, the man who blew the whistle on Israel's illegal nuclear weapons program and served 18 years in an Israeli prison for doing so, has called Michael Collins Piper one of the most "brave and honest" journalists writing today. And now, at long last, "the best of" Michael Collins Piper has been gathered together in one place! This collection includes essays not found on the Internet, previously unpublished writings, interviews (including the long-lost *Final Judgment* tapes), reviews and insights into the JFK assassination, the Oklahoma City bombing, the Federal Reserve, FDR and Pearl Harbor, Israel's deliberate attack on the *USS Liberty*, Israel and Islamic fundamentalism, the murder of Martin Luther King, the Holocaust and much, much more.

Besides the essays by Piper and the Piper interviews, this book also includes synopses of Piper's three major works—*Final Judgment*, *The High Priests of War* and *The New Jerusalem*. *Dirty Secrets*, softcover, 256 pages, \$22.



Order from FIRST AMENDMENT BOOKS, 645 Pennsylvania Avenue SE, Suite 100, Washington, D.C. 20003. No charge for shipping & handling inside the United States. Call 1-888-699-NEWS (6397) toll free to charge to Visa or MasterCard.

American Free Press Newspaper

America's Last Real Newspaper

Weekly issues of uncensored news from a populist and nationalist perspective. The only newspaper in America written exclusively for the American middle class covering the issues that directly affect America's hardest working, most over-taxed segment of society.

One Year (52 issues) \$59

Two Years (104 issues) \$99

Call 1-888-699-NEWS (6397) to charge a subscription to Visa or MasterCard. Refer to the ad in *Dirty Secrets* and get a free copy of Michael Collins Piper's *The New Jerusalem* when you subscribe for two years.

ORDERING COUPON

Please send me:

- ONE YEAR of *American Free Press* (52 issues) for \$59.
- TWO YEARS of *American Free Press* (104 issues) for \$99 plus a free copy of Michael Collins Piper's *The New Jerusalem* FREE.
- ____ copies of *Dirty Secrets* @ \$22 each
- ____ copies of *Final Judgment* @ \$25 each.
- ____ copies of *The High Priests of War* @ \$19.95 each.
- ____ copies of *The New Jerusalem* @ \$19.95 each.
- ____ copies of *Jim Tucker's Bilderberg Diary* @ \$24.95 each.

I ENCLOSE A TOTAL OF: \$ _____

PAYMENT OPTIONS: Check Money Order Visa MasterCard

CARD # _____ EXP. _____

NAME _____

ADDRESS _____

CITY, STATE, ZIP _____

Send payment to: AFP, 645 Pennsylvania Avenue SE, Suite 100, Washington, D.C. 20003 or call 1-888-699-NEWS (6397) and charge to Visa or MasterCard. No charge for shipping and handling. Subscription prices above.